

Review
of the dissertation titled
“Formation of foreign-language pragmatic competence of future English teachers through the use of Web 2.0 technologies”
by Nabiyeva Aizhan Bolatovna
submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph. D.),
in educational program 8D01702 – “Foreign language: two foreign languages”

No.	Criteria	Compliance with criteria (underline one option)	Substantiation of the official reviewer’s position
1.	Dissertation topic (as of the date of approval) corresponds to the directions of science development and/or state programs	1.1 Compliance with priority areas of science development or state programs: 1) the dissertation was completed within the framework of a project or target program funded by the state budget (indicate the title and number of the project/program); 2) the dissertation was completed within another state program (indicate the program title); 3) <u>the dissertation corresponds to a priority direction of science development approved by the Higher Scientific and Technical Commission under the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan (specify the direction).</u>	The dissertation topic is in full accordance with the expected research in the area of applied linguistics/foreign language teaching.
2.	Scientific significance	The work <u>makes</u> / does not make a significant contribution to science, and its importance is <u>well disclosed</u> / not disclosed.	The dissertation has a sufficiently innovative topic, whose empirical investigation guarantees a cutting-edge nature of the research provided the study is conducted according to established methodological principles.
3.	Principle of independence	Independence level: 1) <u>high</u> ; 2) medium; 3) low;	The independence level shown in the dissertation is as high as it can be – the author was solely responsible for

		4) no independence.	designing, executing research, collecting and analysing data, as well as preparing the experimental study environment.
4.	Principle of internal unity	4.1 The relevance of the dissertation is substantiated: 1) <u>substantiated</u> ; 2) partially substantiated; 3) not substantiated.	The thesis poses important research questions, which lead to the specification of the effect of Web 2.0-assisted pragmatic competence development in higher education institutions in Kazakhstan. It strives to achieve even more important purposes of investigating and assessing the impact of the innovative use of Web 2.0 applications operationalised in a course on pragmatic competence development.
		4.2 The content of the dissertation reflects the dissertation topic: 1) <u>reflects</u> ; 2) partially reflects; 3) does not reflect.	The content of the dissertation fully covers the selected problems, there are no sections that would be outside the main line of argumentation or that would be irrelevant for the conducted discussion.
		4.3 The aim and objectives correspond to the dissertation topic: 1) <u>correspond</u> ;	There is full coverage of the aim and objectives adopted in

5.	Principle of scientific novel

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <u>completely new</u>; 2) partially new (25–75% are new); 3) not new (less than 25% are new). 	the field of authoring instructional Web 2.0 environments for use in competence development of university students.
6.	Validity of the main conclusions	All main conclusions <u>are/are not</u> based on scientifically sound evidence or <u>are sufficiently substantiated</u> (for qualitative research and for programs in arts and humanities).	All conclusions are sufficiently backed up by properly collected, selected, analysed and interpreted data items.
7.	Main provisions submitted for defense	<p>The following questions should be answered for each position separately:</p> <p>7.1 Is the provision proven?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <u>proven</u>; 2) rather proven; 3) rather not proven; 4) not proven; 5) impossible to verify in the current formulation. <p>7.2 Is it trivial?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) yes; 2) <u>no</u>; 3) impossible to determine. <p>7.3 Is it new?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <u>yes</u>; 2) no; 3) impossible to determine. <p>7.4 Level of applicability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) narrow; 2) medium; 3) <u>broad</u>; 4) impossible to determine. <p>7.5 Is it proven in publications?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <u>yes</u>; 	The main provisions included in the dissertation are sound, well-considered, properly anchored in well-selected theoretical frameworks and backed up by evidence collected throughout the experimentation process. The provisions have broad applicability and show the solution of a vital problem for the field.

		2) no; 3) impossible to determine.	
8.	Principle of reliability. Reliability of sources and presented information	8.1 The choice of methodology is justified or described in sufficient detail: 1) <u>yes</u> ; 2) no.	The choice of methodology is justified and described in sufficient detail, however, the description lacks specification of instrumentation, issues of reliability and ethical concerns.
		8.2 The results were obtained using modern research methods and data processing/interpretation techniques with the use of computer technologies: 1) <u>yes</u> ; 2) no.	The collected data were subject to advanced statistical processing, not only descriptive but also inferential statistics. The tests selected were appropriate, relevant, well-applied and discussed.
		8.3 Theoretical conclusions, models, and identified relationships are proven and confirmed by experimental research (for pedagogical sciences – through pedagogical experiment): 1) <u>yes</u> ; 2) no.	The dissertation reports a properly designed, conducted and analysed pedagogical experiment, which shows the Author as a fully responsible and knowledgeable independent researcher.
		8.4 Important statements are <u>confirmed</u> / partially confirmed / not confirmed by references to relevant and reliable scientific literature.	All interpretative statements, pedagogical recommendations and conclusions drawn are fully backed up by both relevant literature review and own data.
		8.5 The literature sources used are <u>sufficient</u> / insufficient for the	The literature review has been

		literature review.	conducted based on consultation of a great number of well-selected sources, the review in the theoretical chapter properly distinguishes the quoted input from the Author's interpretation/reflection. The range of sources is exhaustive, highly current, of wide geographical coverage and interdisciplinary in nature.
9	Principle of practical value	9.1 The dissertation has theoretical significance: 1) <u>yes</u> ; 2) no.	The dissertation puts forward a model of developing pragmatic competence in the Web 2.0 instructional setting. The model is properly based on previously published sources, put into test in well-designed research procedures and evaluated based on adequate interpretation of the findings.
		9.2 The dissertation has practical significance and a high probability of application of the results: 1) <u>yes</u> ; 2) no.	The practical recommendations on the application of Web 2.0 tools on the development of pragmatic competence are highly useful, well-phrased, properly adapted to the conceptual level of language teachers.

		9.3 The proposed practical recommendations are new: 1) <u>completely new</u> ; 2) <u>partially new</u> (25–75%); 3) <u>not new</u> (less than 25%).	The recommendations on the development of pragmatic competence in Web 2.0 environment are highly useful, well-phrased, properly adapted to the conceptual level of language teachers.
10.	Quality of writing and formatting	Quality of academic writing: 1) <u>high</u> ; 2) <u>medium</u> ; 3) <u>below average</u> ; 4) <u>low</u> .	Occasional errors, minor problems with spelling authors' names (e.g., Baştürkmen on p. 11, J. Siemens instead of G. Siemens on p. 46), lack of consistency in abbreviating CEFR (one use of CEFRL)
11.	Comments on the dissertation	Review of coursebooks used in Kazakhstan for teaching pragmatic competence should have been developed as one of the research methods, conducted systematically with the help of a uniformed guiding tool, discussed and reported upon in Chapter 2, rather than without distinguishing as a separate method of data collection and in Chapter 1, as is the case now.	
12.	Scientific level of the doctoral candidate's publications on the research topic (if the dissertation is submitted as a series of articles, reviewers evaluate each article)	Not applicable	
13.	Decision of the official reviewer (according to clause 28 of the current Standard Regulations)	Overall, the presented dissertation addresses an important educational problem and manages to solve it in a unique and creative way. Therefore, it fully deserves conferring the Candidate the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the educational program 8D01702 – “Foreign language: two foreign languages”.	

Reviewer:

Academic degree, title, department, faculty, university

Signature, stamp

Full name of the Reviewer

Jarosław Krajka, Ph.D., Associate Professor
Department of Applied Linguistics
Faculty of Languages, Literatures and Cultures
Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Poland

000001353
Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej
WYDZIAŁ FILOLOGICZNY
pl. Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej 4a
20-031 Lublin


PRODZIEKAN
Jarosław Krajka
dr hab. Jarosław Krajka, prof. UMCS