

Determining and Systematizing the Grammatical Minimum Required for a Lexicogrammatical Dictionary of the Kazakh Language

Alfiya A. Soltanbekova

Grammar Department, A. Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics, 29 Kurmangazy St., Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

Talgat B. Ramazanov*

Department of Grammar, Institute of Linguistics, 29 Kurmangazy St., Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

Qymbat B. Slyambekov

Grammar Department, A. Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics, 29 Kurmangazy St., Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

Elmira A. Utebaeva

Ethnolinguistics Department, A. Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics, 29 Kurmangazy St., Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

Aiman A. Zhanabekova

A. Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics, 29 Kurmangazy St., Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

Altyn D. Kegenbekova

Grammar Department, A. Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics, 29 Kurmangazy St., Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

Abstract—This article examines the theoretical and methodological foundations for identifying the grammatical minimum to be included in a lexico-grammatical dictionary designed for teaching Kazakh as a foreign language. The study is grounded in the communicative needs of foreign language learners (non-native speakers) and adopts frequency, structural simplicity, and cultural-cognitive significance as the key criteria for selecting grammatical material. The grammatical categories of the main parts of speech in Kazakh (nouns, verbs, adjectives, numerals, pronouns, adverbs, particles, and interjections) are systematized and presented through a contrastive analysis with English. Grammatical forms are introduced not through direct translation but via functional explanation and descriptive equivalents. Grammatical units that lack direct equivalents are explained through examples that reveal their semantic and pragmatic functions. The results demonstrate that presenting lexis and grammar as an integrated system enhances learners' communicative competence and increases the practical value of the dictionary. The article provides a theoretical foundation for instructional and lexicographic works aimed at teaching agglutinative languages as foreign languages.

Index Terms—grammatical minimum, Kazakh language, lexico-grammatical dictionary, contrastive grammar, non-native speaker

I. INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary context, the growing interest in the Kazakh language is directly linked to globalization processes, the expansion of international academic and cultural exchanges, and Kazakhstan's increasing role in the global arena. The number of learners of Kazakh continues to grow annually due to foreign diplomats, business professionals, students, researchers, and ethnographic tourists. In addition, the increasing amount of Kazakh-language content on digital platforms such as YouTube, TikTok, Instagram, and others contributes to the international visibility and attractiveness of the language. As a result of these trends, the development of high-quality, scientifically grounded teaching materials tailored to the communicative needs of learners of Kazakh as a foreign language has become a pressing issue.

In recent years, Kazakh language teaching programs have been launched at foreign universities, and specialized centers have been established. One of the most significant developments in this direction was the launch of a Kazakh language teaching program at Oxford University in 2024. In parallel, leading universities in Kazakhstan have been opening centers abroad to promote the Kazakh language and culture. In particular, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University has established Abai Centers for Kazakh Language, History and Culture in Turkey, China, Belarus, and Uzbekistan.

However, most existing lexicographic resources for learning Kazakh as a foreign language are translation-oriented and primarily adapted for Russian-speaking audiences. Dictionaries designed specifically for English-speaking learners that

present grammar and lexis as an integrated system are extremely limited. This situation often leads learners to acquire lexical items only at the semantic level, while experiencing difficulties in using them correctly within grammatical structures. To address this gap, researchers at the A. Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics are developing a Lexico-Grammatical Dictionary of Kazakh for English-speaking non-native learners. This project represents a novel and strategically significant initiative in Kazakh linguistics.

The present article focuses on providing a scientific and methodological justification for the grammatical minimum to be included in this dictionary.

Research Aim and Objectives

The main aim of this study is to scientifically and methodologically substantiate and systematize the grammatical minimum to be included in a lexico-grammatical dictionary intended for effective use in teaching Kazakh as a foreign language.

To achieve this aim, the following objectives were identified:

- to determine the key criteria for selecting a grammatical minimum by taking into account the communicative needs of non-native learners of Kazakh;
- to analyze the structural, semantic, and functional characteristics of the main parts of speech in Kazakh (nouns, adjectives, numerals, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, particles, interjections, and onomatopoeic words);
- to conduct a contrastive comparison of the grammatical systems of Kazakh and English;
- to describe the semantic, pragmatic, and cultural-cognitive functions of grammatical forms that lack direct equivalents;
- to demonstrate an effective lexicographic model for presenting the grammatical minimum.

The proposed aims and objectives ensure the theoretical and practical relevance of the study within applied linguistics, pedagogical lexicography, and foreign language teaching methodology, and provide a scientific foundation for developing modern lexico-grammatical resources for teaching Kazakh as a foreign language.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The practice of compiling lexico-grammatical dictionaries is widespread in global lexicography and occupies a significant position within foreign language teaching methodology. Since the late twentieth century, learner-oriented lexicography has increasingly adopted an approach in which lexical units are presented not only in terms of their semantic content, but also in close connection with their grammatical behavior, collocational potential, and typical contextual patterns of use. This shift reflects a growing recognition that effective language acquisition requires an integrated understanding of vocabulary and grammar as mutually interdependent components of linguistic competence.

Among the earliest and most influential works in this field are Oxford Learner's Wordfinder Dictionary, compiled by Hugh Trappes-Lomax (Trappes-Lomax, 1997) as well as Longman Language Activator and Longman Collocations Dictionary (Longman, 2002) and Thesaurus (Mayor, 2013). These dictionaries represent a methodological departure from traditional definitional lexicography by organizing lexical items into semantic fields and by systematically illustrating their grammatical patterns, syntactic environments, and authentic usage in speech and writing. Through this structure, learners are provided not only with information about word meaning, but also with guidance on how words function within larger linguistic units. Consequently, this lexicographic approach is specifically designed to support the development of learners' productive language skills, enabling more accurate, fluent, and contextually appropriate language use.

In English-language lexicographic theory, it is emphasized that learner dictionaries should take into account learners' cognitive characteristics, linguistic interference, and processes of grammatical assimilation. The works of Rundell (2015, pp. 425-445), Atkins (2001, pp. 23-44), Tono (2011, pp. 124-153) and Dziemianko (2022) provide comprehensive analyses of dictionary structure, methods of presenting grammatical information, and the role of visualization. In particular, Dziemianko (2022) demonstrates that graphic elements in both online and printed dictionaries enhance learners' memory retention (pp. 218-234). Studies by Paivio (1979), Nelson et al. (1976, pp. 523-528), and Shelestova et al. (2017, pp. 164-170) likewise show that the combined presentation of visual and verbal codes (the pictorial superiority effect) yields effective results in language learning.

In the field of teaching Russian as a foreign language, the concept of a lexico-grammatical minimum was established relatively early. Lexical minimums developed by N. P. Andryushina, T. V. Kozlova, and other authors are structured according to proficiency levels (A1–C2) and include the vocabulary and grammatical forms required at each level (Andryushina & Kozlova, 2015). These dictionaries present not only lexical units but also morphological features (such as number, gender, case, and inflectional patterns), thereby enhancing learners' grammatical literacy.

In the works of N. A. Kozlova and M. A. Martynova, the principle of acquiring lexis and grammar as an integrated system is emphasized, and the dictionary is viewed not merely as a reference tool but as a component of a broader instructional complex aimed at developing communicative skills (Kozlova & Martynova, 2014).

In applied linguistics, the issue of grammatical minimum is closely linked to Communicative Language Teaching and Task-Based Language Teaching approaches. In the works of Nunan (2004), Ellis (2003) and Long (2015), it is argued that grammar instruction should be based not on linguistic form alone but on communicative function. These approaches emphasize the need to organize grammatical material in accordance with learners' communicative tasks and stages of language development.

In Kazakh linguistics, the unity of language and culture has been extensively explored, beginning with the works of Ualikhanov (1985), where linguistic data reveal the ethnocultural worldview and conceptual system of the Kazakh people, while the studies of Margulan (1986) highlight the linguistic reflection of national culture through a system of terms representing ancient cultural heritage. In the works of Zhubanov (1999), grammatical structures are examined in connection with the cognitive characteristics of the people, whereas Auezov (1991) demonstrates how lexical units function as carriers of national worldview through their contextual usage. Kenesbaev (1977) characterizes phraseological units as a linguistic repository reflecting traditional life and cultural experience, and this line of inquiry is further developed in the studies of Kaidar (2014), Syzdyq (1997), Zhanpeisov (1989), Mankeeva (1997), and other scholars. Collectively, these works demonstrate that linguistic units, including grammatical structures, possess cultural and cognitive significance. A. Kaidar emphasizes that a nation's worldview can be understood through its language (Kaidar, 2009), while Zhanpeisov (1989) and Mankeeva (1997) reveal the ethnocultural content embedded in grammatical and lexical units. Meanwhile, scholars of the Institute of Linguistics point out in their works that, when identifying a grammatical minimum, it is important not to limit the description of linguistic phenomena to the formal system alone, but to adopt frequency of use, functional productivity, and active presence in contemporary language practice as the principal criteria. These principles establish a robust theoretical foundation for effectively adapting grammatical material to instructional and methodological objectives and are directed toward enhancing practical effectiveness in teaching the language to a foreign audience (Momynova et al., 2024).

In addition, the theory of intercultural communicative competence in foreign language teaching (as developed by M. Byram and C. Kramsch) highlights the importance of learning grammar not merely as a structural system but as a cultural code (Byram, 1997; Kramsch, 1998). Contemporary research in this field also demonstrates the effectiveness of organizing grammatical knowledge in a functional way and orienting it toward real language use, suggesting that the selection of a grammatical minimum should be based on communicative needs when systematizing the structures to be included in a lexicogrammatical dictionary (Gesa et al., 2024). Furthermore, studies on second language grammar learning strategies emphasize the necessity of acquiring grammatical knowledge at a practical level, indicating that the determination of a grammatical minimum should rely not only on rule-based systems but also on core lexico-grammatical models required for authentic communication (Pawlak et al., 2025). These theoretical perspectives strengthen the scientific rationale for including phenomena such as the politeness category, possessive forms, particles, and substantivization in the grammatical minimum of the Kazakh language.

Thus, a review of both international and domestic studies clearly demonstrates the need for a lexico-grammatical dictionary that presents lexis and grammar as an integrated system while incorporating a cultural-cognitive component in teaching Kazakh as a foreign language. However, the lack of scholarly and methodological works specifically designed for English-speaking learners that systematically describe the grammatical minimum of Kazakh underscores the relevance of the present study and defines its contribution to the fields of applied linguistics and learner lexicography.

III. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The material for this study consists of data from the Lexico-Grammatical Dictionary of Kazakh project designed for English-speaking non-native learners. This dictionary is a comprehensive educational and lexicographic resource aimed at learners for whom Kazakh is not a native language. Its structure and content were developed with consideration of learners' proficiency levels, communicative needs, and the structural-typological characteristics of the Kazakh language.

The dictionary consists of two interrelated main sections:

- lexical minimum;
- grammatical minimum.

The lexical minimum includes more than 300 lexemes of high ethnocultural significance. These units are systematized into thematic groups reflecting the historical and cultural identity, national worldview, and social experience of the Kazakh people. Selection criteria included frequency of use, communicative value, and cultural-cognitive relevance. Particular emphasis was placed on culturally specific lexemes that lack direct equivalents in other languages but are essential for communication in Kazakh society.

The grammatical minimum section covers grammatical inflection patterns, word-formation potential, collocational features, and functional usage of words in sentences. Grammatical material is presented not as abstract rules but through concrete lexical items, collocations, and short sentences. This approach facilitates intuitive understanding of grammatical usage. Functional equivalents or explanatory descriptions in English are provided, and contrastive analysis is extensively employed.

The following research methods were applied:

- lexicographic selection and systematization;
- semantic analysis;
- structural-grammatical analysis;
- contrastive Kazakh–English analysis;
- cognitive and pragmatic methods;
- descriptive and example-based explanation.

The methodological framework of the study is grounded in foreign language teaching theory, pedagogical lexicography,

contrastive linguistics, and research on the relationship between language and culture. These theoretical foundations enabled the development of an effective learner-oriented lexico-grammatical model for teaching Kazakh as a foreign language.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As a result of the study, three key criteria for selecting the grammatical minimum were identified:

- frequency;
- structural simplicity;
- cultural-cognitive significance.

The grammatical minimum covers core grammatical categories required for A1–A2 level learners, including noun cases, possessive and plural forms, adjective degrees of comparison, verb tense and mood forms, affirmative and negative constructions, pronoun inflection, numeral types, and the functions of adverbs, particles, interjections, and onomatopoeic words.

Noun (NOUN)

– Derivational suffixes: +шы/ші (жұмысшы ‘worker’, әнші ‘singer’), +лық/лік (достық ‘friendship’, сөздік ‘dictionary’), +хана/қана (аурухана ‘hospital’, дәрісхана ‘lecture hall’). Suffix patterns and their English functional equivalents are presented in tabular form.

– Inflectional patterns: plural, possessive, and case suffixes; explanations are provided through comparison with English equivalents (plural -s/-es, possessive ’s, prepositions).

Examples for each part of speech are presented in the nine tables below.

Adjective (ADJECTIVE)

– Semantic classification: adjectives are grouped into semantic categories such as color, size, taste, speed, and others; degrees of comparison (-лау/-леу, -рақ/-рек, intensive forms) are analyzed through examples.

– The phenomenon of substantivization (e.g., the adjective қапа acquiring the meaning of a person) is examined, along with strategies for rendering such meanings in English (e.g., a man in black, the dark one).

Numeral (NUMERAL)

– Simple and compound numerals; characteristics of ordinal, collective, and approximate numerals are described; English equivalents (cardinal, ordinal, collective, approximate) are provided. Examples are preserved in tabular form.

Pronouns (PRONOUNS)

– Complex system: classification, possessive forms, and case inflection are analyzed; a detailed description of the interrogative pronoun қашан (“when”) is included, with a case-declension table.

– Possessive forms are compared with English possessive pronouns.

In the Kazakh language, the personal pronoun ol can take possessive, case, and personal endings, and it can also receive the plural marker, as in olar (“they”). This morphological flexibility distinguishes ol from other personal pronouns. In addition, the pronoun ol combines with other words and refers to a third party—namely, a person, object, or phenomenon that is neither the speaker (мен – I) nor the addressee (сен – you).

Furthermore, the pronoun ol may function with a demonstrative meaning, as in expressions such as ol kisi (“that person”), ol kitap (“that book”), and ol adam (“that man”). In English, the Kazakh pronoun ol corresponds to the personal pronouns he, she, and it, depending on context. The declension, conjugation, and possessive forms of this pronoun are presented in detail in Tables 6, 7, and 8.

Adverb (ADVERB)

– Semantic groups: time, place, manner, cause–effect, and degree; positional characteristics (pre-verbal position in Kazakh) are highlighted and compared with English usage.

Verb (VERB)

– Tense categories (present, past, future), mood forms (imperative, desiderative), affirmative and negative constructions, and verb–auxiliary combinations (келе жатыр, айтып отыр) are analyzed.

– Differences between Kazakh subject agreement expressed through personal endings and English subject marking via separate pronouns are examined.

Onomatopoeic Words, Interjections, and Particles

– Onomatopoeic words: sound-imitative and motion-imitative groups, along with strategies for rendering them in English.

– Interjections: their cultural and pragmatic meanings (e.g., Astapyralla!, Tñ!) and explanatory descriptions.

– Particles: conjunctions and postpositions (және, бірақ, не, немесе, үшін, туралы, кейін) and discourse particles (ғана, да, ғой), with their sentence functions and English equivalents.

Integration of the Cultural-Cognitive Component

– A cultural-functional analysis of colors, numerals (e.g., жеті ‘seven’), and politeness forms (сіз/сен); contrastive examples are provided (e.g., seventh heaven vs. cultural meanings of жеті).

– The necessity of presenting cultural-cognitive lexemes within grammatical contexts is substantiated.

Contrastive analysis demonstrates the fundamental difference between the agglutinative structure of Kazakh and the analytic system of English. From a pedagogical perspective, several of these grammatical forms may present difficulty

for foreign learners due to the absence of direct equivalents in English and the need to interpret their functional and pragmatic meanings in context. For instance, the case system, possessive suffixes, and substantivization require learners to move beyond word-level translation and develop sensitivity to structural and discourse-level cues. Consequently, their acquisition is facilitated through repeated exposure in meaningful lexical contexts and through contrastive explanation that highlights both structural differences and communicative functions. Grammatical forms that lack direct equivalents are presented through functional description.

Although the functions of parts of speech in the Kazakh and English languages are in some cases similar, it has been observed that their semantic load and spheres of use are not identical. For instance, in the Kazakh language, adjectives are not limited to the function of an attribute within a sentence; rather, in certain contexts they may undergo substantivization and acquire a nominal meaning. This phenomenon demonstrates the flexibility and semantic richness of the Kazakh language.

For example, in sentences such as “Bir qara körindi” (“A black one appeared”) or “Qara keldi” (“The black one came”), the word qara (“black”) departs from its original adjectival meaning and functions as a noun denoting a person. Such usage is natural and normatively acceptable in Kazakh. In contrast, in English, adjectives do not systematically function as independent nouns in this manner. Consequently, the sentence “Qara keldi” cannot be directly translated as Black came; instead, it must be rendered through analytical constructions such as A man in black came or The dark one came. This divergence highlights a difference in the cognitive structure of the two languages: in Kazakh, describing a person through an external feature – particularly color – is considered a culturally established norm.

Similarly, the cultural and cognitive load of colors and numbers constitutes one of the key indicators of the distinctive nature of the Kazakh language. Within the Kazakh worldview, colors do not merely denote physical characteristics but carry symbolic and sacral meanings. For example, the color aq (“white”) is associated with purity, honesty, and goodness (aq jol “good journey,” aq niet “pure intention”); kök (“blue/sky-colored”) is linked to the sky, eternity, and sacredness (kök aspan “blue sky”); while sary (“yellow”) represents notions of space and time (sary bel “yellow ridge,” sary dala “vast steppe”). These meanings are transmitted from generation to generation through linguistic units and have become deeply entrenched in national consciousness.

Numbers also possess a pronounced cultural-cognitive dimension. In traditional Kazakh worldview, the number seven (jeti) is regarded as sacred. This concept is reflected in stable expressions such as jeti ata (“seven ancestors”), jeti qazyna (“seven treasures”), and jeti jetim (“seven orphans”). These expressions transcend mere numerical meaning and convey information about the social structure, moral principles, and spiritual values of the Kazakh people. The English language also contains numerous phraseological units involving the number seven; however, their semantic content and cultural foundations differ. For instance, the expression seventh heaven denotes a state of extreme happiness and bliss, while seven virtues refers to the seven cardinal virtues rooted in Christian doctrine. Although a degree of semantic similarity can be observed, their cultural and conceptual bases are fundamentally different. Therefore, such units should not be treated as absolute equivalents, but rather as culturally comparable phenomena.

Significant differences are also evident in the pronoun systems of the two languages. The Kazakh pronoun siz does not merely indicate second person reference; it simultaneously conveys politeness, formality, social status, and interpersonal distance within the speech act. In English, all of these pragmatic functions are represented by a single pronoun, you. As a result, in English the speaker’s attitude toward the addressee and the stylistic tone of interaction are typically inferred through context, intonation, or additional lexical means. This distinction demonstrates that grammatical categories in Kazakh possess not only structural significance but also substantial social and cultural content.

In general, many grammatical units in the Kazakh language exhibit cognitive and cultural characteristics and function as linguistic manifestations of national worldview. Accordingly, linguistic units that reflect the cultural and national identity of the Kazakh people were given particular attention in determining the grammatical minimum of the dictionary. Such an approach enables the dictionary to function not only as a linguistic reference tool but also as a source of cultural and cognitive knowledge.

TABLE 1
DERIVATIONAL SUFFIXES OF KAZAKH NOUNS PRESENTED IN THE GRAMMATICAL MINIMUM (WITH ENGLISH EQUIVALENTS)

Semantic category	Kazakh suffix	Example (Kazakh)	English equivalent	Example (English)
Profession	-шы / -ші	әнші	-er, -ist, -or	singer, worker
		жұмысшы		worker
		домбырашы		dombra player
Abstract notion	лық / -лік / -дық / -дік / -тық / -тік	достық	ship, -hood, -ness	friendship
		балалық		childhood
Place / location	-хана / -қана	аурухана	house, room, hall	hospital
		дәрісхана		lecture hall

Note. The table demonstrates how derivational suffixes are introduced through high-frequency lexical items. English equivalents are provided as functional rather than direct morphological correspondences.

TABLE 2
INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS OF KAZAKH NOUNS AND THEIR FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENTS IN ENGLISH

Grammatical category	Kazakh suffix	Example (Kazakh)	English equivalent	Translation
Plural	-лар / -лер / -дар / -дер / -тар / -тер	кітаптар	-s / -es	books
Possessive (1st person sg.)	-ым / -ім / -м	кітабым	my	my book
Possessive (2nd person sg.)	-ың / -ің / -ң	кітабың	your	your book
Possessive (3rd person sg.)	-ы / -і / -сы / -сі	кітабы	his / her	his book
Genitive case	-ның / -нің / -дың / -дің / -тың / -тің	кітаптың мұқабасы	's / of	the book's cover

Note. Unlike Kazakh, English expresses most case relations analytically through prepositions or possessive constructions.

TABLE 3
SEMANTIC GROUPS OF ADJECTIVES IN THE GRAMMATICAL MINIMUM

Semantic group	Kazakh adjective	English gloss	Example (Kazakh)	Example (English)
Color	ақ	white	ақ қағаз	white paper
	қара	black	қара ат	black horse
Size / volume	үлкен	big	үлкен үй	big house
	кіші	small	кіші бөлме	small room
Taste	тәтті	sweet	тәтті бал	sweet honey
Speed	жылдам	fast	жылдам көлік	fast transport

Note. Adjectives are presented without inflection, reflecting their invariant morphological nature in Kazakh.

TABLE 4
CLASSIFICATION OF NUMERALS BY STRUCTURE

Classification criterion	Kazakh examples	English equivalents
Simple	екі, он	two, ten
Derived	бірінші, бірер	first, some
Compound	он бес, бес жүз	fifteen, five hundred

TABLE 5
SEMANTIC TYPES OF NUMERALS IN KAZAKH AND THEIR ENGLISH FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENTS

Type	Kazakh example	English equivalent
Cardinal	бір, екі, жүз	one, two, hundred
Ordinal	бірінші	first
Collective	екеу, үшеу	two of them
Approximate	бірер, оншақты	about ten

Note. Collective and approximate numerals in Kazakh lack direct morphological equivalents in English and are rendered analytically.

TABLE 6
POSSESSIVE FORMS OF THE PRONOUN “OL”

Person	Singular	Plural
1st person	onym (my he/she/it)	onymyz (our he/she/it)
2nd person	onyñ (your he/she/it)	onyñ / onyñyz (your he/she/it, informal / polite)
3rd person	onysy (his/her/its)	onysy (their)

TABLE 7
CASE DECLENSION OF THE PRONOUN “OL”

Case	Form
Nominative	ol
Genitive	onyñ
Dative	oğan
Accusative	ony
Locative	onda
Ablative	odan
Instrumental	onymen

TABLE 8
PERSONAL CONJUGATION OF THE PRONOUN “OL”

Person	Singular	Plural
1st person	olmyn (I am he/she/it)	olmız (we are he/she/it)
2nd person	olsyñ / olsyz (you are he/she/it, informal / formal)	olsyñdar / olsyzdar (you are he/she/it, plural)
3rd person	ol (he/she/it is)	olar (they are)

TABLE 9
CASE FORMS OF THE INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN “ҚАШАН?” (WHEN?)

Case	Singular	Plural
Nominative	Қашан?	—
Dative	Қашанға (дейін)?	—
Ablative	Қашаннан?	—

Note. The pronoun *қашан* is partially declinable and does not take possessive or plural markers.

Example (Adverbs): Ол тез келді. – *He came quickly.*

Example (Verb forms): Мен жазамын. – *I write.*

Example (Onomatopoeia): Тыр еткен дыбыс естілді. – *A knock was heard.*

V. CONCLUSION

In the process of selecting grammatical material, such criteria as frequency of use, structural simplicity, and cultural-cognitive significance were taken as a basis. Specifically, grammatical forms that are frequently used in spoken language, communicatively essential, and relatively easy to master from a structural perspective were given priority. This approach made it possible to present the complex agglutinative system of the Kazakh language to inophones in a comprehensible and practically applicable way. Moreover, taking into account the cultural and pragmatic dimensions of grammatical forms allowed them to be presented not merely as linguistic units, but as phenomena intrinsically connected to national worldview.

The results of the study demonstrate the high effectiveness of presenting lexis and grammar as an integrated system within the educational process. Rather than teaching grammatical forms as isolated rules, presenting them through concrete lexical units, fixed collocational patterns, and short functional sentences contributes to transforming learners' grammatical knowledge into active, productive linguistic skills.

In addition, the contrastive description of Kazakh grammatical structures alongside their functional equivalents in English was found to significantly reduce linguistic interference and to facilitate the acquisition of a new linguistic system.

One of the most significant outcomes of the study is the scientific substantiation of integrating a cultural-cognitive component into the grammatical minimum. It has been demonstrated that grammatical phenomena in Kazakh—such as possessive forms, the case system, the category of politeness, particles, and substantivization—possess not only structural, but also cognitive, pragmatic, and cultural functions. These grammatical units convey essential information about the social relations, worldview, and value system of the Kazakh people.

This approach makes it possible to develop the teaching of Kazakh as a foreign language beyond a purely linguistic level and toward the sphere of intercultural communication. By mastering grammatical forms, learners simultaneously gain insight into communicative norms, politeness strategies, and national identity within Kazakh society. This, in turn, contributes to the comprehensive development of learners' communicative competence.

The proposed grammatical minimum model and lexicographic presentation methods may be effectively applied in the future to the development of lexicogrammatical dictionaries, textbooks, online educational platforms, and level-based curricula designed for English-speaking inophones. Furthermore, the findings of the study can contribute substantially to improving methodologies for teaching Kazakh as a foreign language, expanding teachers' methodological resources, and strengthening the position of the Kazakh language within the international educational space.

Thus, the present study expands the scientific and methodological foundation of Kazakh language research within the fields of applied linguistics, educational lexicography, and foreign language teaching theory, and provides a solid theoretical and practical basis for future comprehensive and interdisciplinary research aimed at teaching the grammatical system of Kazakh as a foreign language.

FINANCING

The work was carried out within the framework of program-targeted financing «BR24993001 Development of a Large Language Model (LLM) to Support the Kazakh Language and Technological Progress», Baitursunov Institute, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

REFERENCES

- [1] Andryushina, N. P., & Kozlova, T. V. (2015). *Lexical minimum for Russian as a foreign language: Elementary level. General proficiency* (5th ed.). Zlatoust.
- [2] Atkins, B. T. S. (2001). Learning how to use a dictionary: An empirical study. *Lexikos*, 11, 23–44.
- [3] Auezov, M. (1991). *Thoughts on literature and language*. Zhazushy.
- [4] Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Multilingual Matters.
- [5] Dziemianko, A. (2022). The usefulness of graphic illustrations in online dictionaries. *ReCALL*, 34(2), 218–234. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344021000264>
- [6] Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- [7] Gesa, F., Frigolé, N., & Suárez, M.-M. (2024). EFL grammar teaching applying the Just-in-Time teaching methodology: An exploratory study. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 39, 202–216. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2024.39.14>

- [8] Kaidar, A. (2009). *Kazakhs in the world of their mother tongue (Ethnolinguistic dictionary): Human*. Daik-Press.
- [9] Kaidar, A. (2014). *A lifetime in science: Collection of articles and reports* (Vol. 1). Sardar.
- [10] Kenesbaev, I. (1977). *Phraseological dictionary of the Kazakh language*. Gylym.
- [11] Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford University Press.
- [12] Long, M. H. (2015). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. Wiley Blackwell.
- [13] Longman. (2002). *Longman language activator: Helps you write and speak natural English*. Pearson Education Limited.
- [14] Mankeeva, Zh. (1997). *Language and culture: Understanding national mentality through language*. Gylym.
- [15] Margulan, A. (1986). *Ancient culture of the Kazakh people*. Gylym.
- [16] Mayor, M. (Ed.). (2013). *Longman collocations dictionary and thesaurus*. Pearson Education Limited.
- [17] Momynova, B. K., Slyambekov, Q. B., Soltanbekova, A. A., Imangazina, M. A., & Ramazanov, T. B. (2024). The fourth generation of academic Kazakh grammar. *Novye Issledovaniya Tuvy*, (3), 326–340. <https://doi.org/10.25178/nit.2024.3.20>
- [18] Nelson, D. L., Reed, U. S., & Walling, J. R. (1976). Pictorial superiority effect. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*, 2(5), 523–528.
- [19] Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- [20] Paivio, A. (1979). *Imagery and verbal processes*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- [21] Pawlak, M., Shirvan, M. E., Karimpour, S., & Yazarloo, F. (2025). L2 language grammar learning strategies: A Q methodology study. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2025.2543291>
- [22] Rundell, M. (2015). From print to digital: Implications for dictionary policy and lexicographic conventions. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 28(4), 425–445.
- [23] Shelestova, T. Y., Zhetpisbayeva, B. A., & Kazimova, D. A. (2017). The effect of illustrations and simulations in English course books in a Kazakhstani context on primary school students' English language achievement. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 10(1), 163–174. <https://doi.org/10.26822/iejee.2017131946>
- [24] Syzdyq, R. (1997). *The power of words*. Sanat.
- [25] Tono, Y. (2011). Application of eye-tracking in EFL learners' dictionary look-up process research. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 24(1), 124–153.
- [26] Trappes-Lomax, H. (1997). *Oxford learner's wordfinder dictionary*. Oxford University Press.
- [27] Ualikhanov, Sh. (1985). *Selected works* (Vol. 1). Gylym.
- [28] Zhanpeisov, E. N. (1989). *Ethnocultural lexicon of the Kazakh language (Based on the works of M. Auezov)*. Gylym.
- [29] Zhubanov, Q. (1999). *Kazakh language studies (Selected works)*. Gylym.

Alfiya ABDYKENOVNA Soltanbekova was born in Kazakhstan. She obtained the academic degree of Candidate of Philology in Astana on December 25, 2010, by the decision of the Committee for Control in Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

She is currently the Head of the Grammar Department at the A. Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics in Almaty. Her research interests include Kazakh grammar, grammatical minimum, lexico-grammatical description, and the methodology of teaching Kazakh as a second and foreign language. She is the author and co-author of several scholarly publications in the field of Kazakh linguistics.

Dr. Soltanbekova is an active researcher in the field of grammar studies. Her academic interests encompass functional grammar, grammatical systematization, and language teaching methodology. She can be contacted at alfiabarlybaeva24@gmail.com ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3513-4012>

Talgat BEKBOLATULY Ramazanov* was born in Kazakhstan. He holds the academic degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD). He currently serves as a Researcher at the Grammar Department of the A. Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics and is the *corresponding author* of this article. Contact: tphd-92@mail.ru ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4405-5914>

He has published more than 20 research articles in international and national academic journals. His main research interests include discourse studies, text linguistics, grammar, cognitive linguistics, and terminology.

Kymbat BERIKULY Slyambekov was born in Kazakhstan. He completed his Master's degree in Kazakh Philology at Al-Farabi Kazakh National University in 2024 and was awarded the degree of Master of Philology.

He is currently a Junior Researcher at the Grammar Department of the A. Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics in Almaty. His research interests include grammar, political linguistics, and speech culture. He is the author and co-author of several scholarly publications in the field of Kazakh linguistics.

Kymbat Slyambekov is a Master of Philology and a researcher in the field of grammar. His academic interests encompass functional grammar, political linguistics, and speech culture. Contact: zaqpost@gmail.com ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9731-0448>

Elmira ABDIGALIQZY Utebayeva was born in Kazakhstan. She obtained the academic degree of Candidate of Philology in Astana on June 14, 2011, by the decision of the Committee for Control in Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

She is currently the Head of the Ethnolinguistics Department at the A. Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics in Almaty. Her research interests include linguoculturology, ethnolinguistics, paremiology, lexicography, and corpus linguistics. She is the author and co-author of several scholarly publications in the field of Kazakh linguistics.

Dr. Utebayeva is an active researcher in linguocultural and ethnolinguistic studies. Her works focus on the semantics of ethnomarked units in the Kazakh language, the cultural and cognitive content of proverbs and phraseological units, as well as the systematization of cultural information based on corpus data. Contact: eutebaeva39@gmail.com ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-9089-1909>

Aiman ABDILDAEVNA Zhanabekova was born in Kazakhstan. She obtained the academic degree of Doctor of Philology in Astana on July 13, 2011 (Protocol No. 5), by the decision of the Committee for Control in Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

She is currently the Head of the Applied Linguistics Department at the A. Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics in Almaty. Her research interests include Kazakh grammar, functional grammar, applied linguistics, corpus linguistics, and artificial intelligence. She is the author and co-author of several scholarly publications in the field of Kazakh linguistics.

Dr. Zhanabekova is an active researcher in the fields of grammar and applied linguistics. Her academic interests encompass functional grammar, communicative grammar, lexicography, and corpus linguistics. Contact: aiman_miras@mail.ru ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6199-7444>

Altyn DAULETKULKYZY Kegenbekova was born in Kazakhstan. She obtained the degree of Master of Humanities in Almaty on June 14, 2019, by the decision of the State Attestation Commission.

She is currently a Junior Researcher at the Grammar Department of the A. Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics in Almaty. Her research interests include Kazakh grammar, grammatical minimum, lexico-grammatical description, and the methodology of teaching Kazakh as a second and foreign language. She is the author and co-author of several scholarly publications in the field of Kazakh linguistics.

Altyn Kegenbekova is a Master of Humanities and an active researcher in the field of grammar studies. Her academic interests encompass functional grammar, grammatical systematization, and language teaching methodology. Contact: kegenbekova.altyn@gmail.com ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9428-3608>