

REVIEW
of the official reviewer for dissertation work
of **Iskakova Gulnaz Nurdildayevna** on the theme “Prosodic portrait of academic discourse” presented for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy (PhD) in the specialty “6D021000 – Foreign Philology”

№	Criteria	Eligibility (one of the options must be checked)	Justification of the position of the official reviewer
1.	The topic of the thesis (as of the date of its approval) corresponds to the directions of development of science and/or state programs	<p>1.1 Compliance with priority areas of science development or government programs:</p> <p>1) The thesis was completed within the framework of a project or target program financed from the state budget (indicate the name and number of the project or program)</p> <p>2) The thesis was completed within the framework of another state program (indicate the name of the program)</p> <p>3) The dissertation corresponds to the priority direction of the development of science, approved by the Higher Scientific and Technical Commission under the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan (indicate the direction)</p>	<p>The topic of the dissertation research, “Prosodic portrait of academic discourse,” corresponds to the priority areas of science and education development in the Republic of Kazakhstan related to the improvement of academic literacy, the quality of higher education, and the development of effective academic communication in a multilingual and international academic environment. These priorities are reflected in national strategic and regulatory documents, including the State Program of Education Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2011–2020, approved by the Decree of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 1118 dated December 7, 2010, which emphasized the modernization of higher education, the development of academic competencies, and integration into the global educational space; the State Program on the Realization of Language Policy in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2020–2025, approved by the Resolution of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated December 31, 2019, which aims at expanding linguistic capital and increasing</p>

		<p>proficiency in foreign languages, including English; and the Concept for the Development of Higher Education and Science in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2023–2029, approved by the Resolution of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 248 dated March 28, 2023, which prioritizes internationalization of higher education, development of research culture, and enhancement of academic communication competencies in higher education institutions.</p>
<p>2.</p> <p>Importance for science</p>	<p>The work makes/does not make a significant contribution to science, and its importance is well disclosed/not disclosed</p>	<p>The dissertation presents an original and independent study of the prosodic and discursive features of academic speech in higher education, which contributes to the development of discourse analysis, experimental phonetics, and applied linguistics. The scientific results were obtained independently by the author based on a comprehensive theoretical analysis of works by domestic and foreign scholars, systematic and comparative analysis of academic discourse data, in the form of conveyed lectures and experimental-phonetic investigation of their prosodic parameters. It should be highlighted that to date, lectures delivered in Kazakh and English as media of instruction have not been systematically examined from the perspective of prosodic features associated with coherence-building devices.</p>
<p>3.</p> <p>The principle of independence</p>	<p>Self-reliance level:</p> <p>1) High; 2) Medium; 3) Low; 4) No independence</p>	<p>The research demonstrates a high level of academic independence, as evidenced by the author's autonomous formulation of the research problem and objectives, as well as the development and application of original</p>

		<p>analytical procedures. All major stages of the study, including data selection, experimental-phonetic analysis, and interpretation of empirical findings, were carried out independently.</p>
<p>4. The principle of inner unity</p>	<p>4.1 Justification of the relevance of the thesis: 1) Justified; 2) Partially justified; 3) Not justified.</p> <p>4.2 The content of the thesis reflects the topic of the thesis: 1) Reflects; 2) Partially reflects; 3) Does not reflect</p> <p>4.3. The purpose and objectives correspond to the topic of the thesis: 1) correspond; 2) partially correspond; 3) do not correspond</p> <p>4.4 All sections and provisions of the thesis are logically interconnected: 1) completely interconnected; 2) the interconnection is partial; 3) there is no interconnection</p>	<p>The topic of the dissertation is relevant and timely, as it focuses on the prosodic organization of academic university lectures delivered in Kazakh and English. By examining pitch, intensity, pause, and duration as key mechanisms of discourse structuring and coherence building, the author addresses an insufficiently explored area of oral academic communication. The comparative and discourse-oriented approach enhances the theoretical value of the study and responds to the practical needs of multilingual higher education, confirming the significance of the research.</p> <p>The content of the thesis fully reflects the stated topic and ensures a comprehensive analysis of the prosodic features of academic discourse.</p> <p>The purpose of the thesis is clearly defined and directly related to the stated topic. The research objectives are logically formulated and consistently aimed at achieving the stated purpose through the analysis of pitch, intensity, pause, and duration in academic discourse.</p> <p>All sections and provisions of the thesis are logically interconnected and consistently developed. The internal structure of the work ensures a coherent progression from theoretical foundations to empirical analysis and</p>

	<p>4.5 The new solutions (principles, methods) proposed by the author are reasoned and evaluated in comparison with the known solutions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) there is a critical analysis; 2) partial analysis; 3) the analysis does not represent one's own opinions, but quotes from other authors 	<p>conclusions.</p> <p>The new solutions and analytical principles proposed by the author are well-reasoned and grounded in a solid theoretical and methodological framework. The study offers an original approach to the analysis of academic discourse by systematically integrating prosodic parameters such as pitch, intensity, pause, and duration into a unified prosodic portrait of university lectures. The proposed methods are critically evaluated in comparison with existing approaches in prosodic and discourse studies, which allows the author to demonstrate their advantages and limitations. This comparative evaluation confirms the validity of the proposed solutions and their contribution to the further development of discourse-oriented phonetic research.</p>
<p>5. Scientific novelty principle</p>	<p>5.1 Are the scientific results and provisions new?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) completely new; 2) partially new (25-75% are new); 3) not new (less than 25% are new) 	<p>The first provision is new, as the author proposes an original definition of academic discourse that integrates educational and scientific components with prosodic and coherence-oriented characteristics, which are not explicitly combined in existing definitions.</p> <p>The second provision demonstrates novelty in treating lecture effectiveness as a result of the interaction between content organization and prosodic structuring, with coherence-building devices analyzed as central mechanisms of academic communication in Kazakh- and English-medium lectures.</p> <p>The third provision is new in constructing a prosodic portrait of the lecture genre based on a</p>

		<p>systematic analysis of pitch, intensity, pause, and duration across different coherence-building devices, revealing stable and device-specific prosodic patterns.</p> <p>The fourth provision contains novel results in identifying and describing first-language transfer effects in English-medium lectures and their impact on prosodic realization and discourse interpretation.</p> <p>The fifth provision introduces novelty by substantiating the view of prosody as an integral component of lecture design and by formulating pedagogically relevant conclusions concerning prosodic adaptation in English-medium instruction.</p>
	<p>5.2 Are the dissertation findings new? 1) completely new; 2) partially new (25-75% are new); 3) not new (less than 25% are new)</p>	<p>The dissertation findings are completely new. They introduce an original prosodic definition of academic discourse and present a comparative, coherence-based analysis of pitch, intensity, pause, and duration in Kazakh- and English-medium university lectures, all of which were recorded and selected from MOOCs of Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, ensuring the authenticity of the empirical material.</p>
	<p>5.3 Technical, technological, economic or management decisions are new and reasonable: 1) completely new; 2) partially new (25-75% are new); 3) not new (less than 25% are new)</p>	<p>The technical and methodological decisions proposed in the dissertation are new and well-reasoned, as the author applies instrumental prosodic analysis using PRAAT to examine pitch, intensity, pause, and duration within a coherence-based framework of academic discourse.</p>

6.	The validity of the main findings	All main conclusions are/are not based on scientifically significant evidence or well-grounded (for qualitative research and areas of training in the arts and humanities)			All main conclusions are well grounded and based on scientifically significant qualitative evidence obtained through systematic discourse and instrumental prosodic analysis of authentic lecture data.
7.	The main provisions for the defense	<p>It is necessary to answer the following questions for each provision separately: 7.1 Is the provision proven?</p> <p>1) proven; 2) rather proven; 3) rather not proven; 4) not proven</p> <p>7.2 Is it trivial? 1) yes; 2) no</p> <p>7.3 Is it new? 1) yes; 2) no</p> <p>7.4 Application level: 1) narrow; 2) medium; 3) wide</p> <p>7.5 Is it proven in the article? 1) yes; 2) no</p>		<p>7.1 The first provision is proven, as the author's definition of academic discourse is theoretically grounded in contemporary discourse studies and supported by qualitative analysis of Kazakh- and English-medium university lectures, demonstrating the integration of educational and scientific features through prosodic coherence mechanisms.</p> <p>The second provision is supported, as the effectiveness of the lecture genre is substantiated by a systematic analysis showing the interdependence of content organization and prosodic structuring, with coherence-building devices empirically identified and functionally described in the lecture data.</p> <p>The third provision is supported, as the prosodic portrait of the lecture genre is confirmed by consistent PRAAT-based measurements of pitch, intensity, pause, and duration, revealing stable, device-specific prosodic patterns across the analyzed lectures.</p> <p>The fourth provision is proven, as first-language transfer effects in English-medium lectures are evidenced by recurring lexical and prosodic features that diverge from standard English norms and are consistently observed in the empirical material.</p> <p>The fifth provision is proven, as the integral role</p>	

	<p>of prosody in lecture design is demonstrated by the cumulative findings, which show systematic correlations between prosodic patterns, communicative effectiveness, and audience orientation in different instructional contexts.</p> <p>7.2 All provisions are not trivial. They address insufficiently explored aspects of academic discourse by integrating prosodic analysis with coherence-building mechanisms, proposing an original definition of academic discourse, and providing a comparative examination of Kazakh- and English-medium university lectures that present the original research. The findings extend existing theoretical models and offer empirically grounded insights that go beyond descriptive or self-evident observations.</p> <p>7.3 All provisions are new. They introduce an original prosodic definition of academic discourse, propose a coherence-based framework for lecture analysis, and, for the first time, systematically examine the prosodic realization of coherence-building devices in Kazakh-medium university lectures alongside English-medium instruction using instrumental analysis.</p> <p>7.4 The results of the dissertation may be applied at a wide level, especially at the university level in courses on phonetics, discourse analysis, and academic speaking, as well as in the training of lecturers delivering courses in Kazakh- and English-medium instruction. In addition, the findings can be used in compiling a subcorpus of academic discourse, including university lectures annotated for prosodic parameters and</p>
--	---

		<p>coherence-building devices, for further linguistic research and pedagogical applications.</p> <p>7.5 The main provisions are validated in articles published on the subject of the thesis.</p> <p>The methodological choice is justified, as the author combines qualitative discourse analysis with instrumental prosodic analysis using PRAAT, which fully corresponds to the research objectives and ensures the reliability and validity of the findings.</p>
<p>8.</p> <p>The principle of reliability</p> <p>Reliability of sources and information provided</p>	<p>8.1 Choice of methodology - is justified or the methodology is described in sufficient detail</p> <p>1) yes; 2) no</p> <p>8.2 The results of the thesis were obtained using modern methods of scientific research and methods of processing and interpreting data using computer technologies:</p> <p>1) yes; 2) no</p> <p>8.3 Theoretical conclusions, models, identified relationships and patterns have been proven and confirmed by experimental research (for areas of training in pedagogical sciences, the results have been proven on the basis of a pedagogical experiment):</p> <p>1) yes; 2) no</p> <p>8.4 Important statements are confirmed / partially confirmed / not confirmed by references to current and reliable scientific literature</p> <p>8.5 Used literature sources are sufficient/not sufficient for a literature review</p>	<p>The results of the thesis were obtained using modern methods of scientific research, as well as contemporary techniques for processing and interpreting data based on computer technologies.</p> <p>The theoretical conclusions, models, and identified relationships and patterns are well grounded and confirmed by experimental and instrumental research based on the analysis of authentic lecture data.</p> <p>The key statements of the thesis are confirmed by references to current and reliable scientific literature.</p> <p>The literature sources used are sufficient for a comprehensive literature review. They adequately reflect current and reliable research on academic discourse, prosody, and discourse analysis.</p>
<p>9</p> <p>Practical value principle</p>	<p>9.1 The thesis has theoretical value:</p>	<p>The thesis has theoretical value. The obtained</p>

		<p>1) yes; 2) no</p> <p>9.2 The thesis is of practical importance and there is a high probability of applying the results obtained in practice: 1) yes; 2) no</p> <p>9.3 Are the practice suggestions new? 1) completely new; 2) partially new (25-75% are new); 3) not new (less than 25% are new)</p>	<p>results enrich theories of academic discourse and prosody by introducing a coherence-based approach to the analysis of university lectures.</p> <p>The findings obtained may be used in university teaching, lecturer training for Kazakh- and English-medium instruction, the development of academic speaking materials, and the compilation of annotated subcorpora of academic discourse.</p> <p>The practical suggestions are completely new. They are based on an original prosodic and coherence-oriented analysis of Kazakh and English-medium university lectures and propose novel applications for lecturer training, academic speaking instruction, and the development of annotated academic discourse subcorpora.</p>
10.	The quality of writing and design	<p>Academic writing quality: 1) high; 2) average; 3) below average; 4) low.</p>	<p>The thesis is written in a highly proficient academic writing style.</p>
11.	Notes on a thesis		<p>Some remarks on the thesis: 1. the scope of the empirical material may be expanded in future studies to further confirm the observed prosodic patterns. 2. minor technical inaccuracies were identified; however, they do not affect the overall clarity or understanding of the thesis.</p>
12.	Scientific level of the doctoral student's articles on the topic of research (in case of defense of the dissertation in the form of a series of articles, the official		<p>The articles published are relevant to the issues of the thesis topic. The findings are presented in the publications.</p>

<p>reviewers comment on the scientific level of each article of the doctoral student on the topic of research)</p>		
<p>13. Decision of the official reviewer (pursuant to paragraph 28 of the present Model Regulations)</p>		<p>The thesis, "Prosodic portrait of academic discourse," submitted for defence, is a completed study. I fully support the conferral of the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree in "6D021000 – Foreign Philology" upon Iskakova Gulnaz Nurdildayevna.</p>

In reviews, official reviewers indicate one of the following solutions:

- 1) to award the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) or Doctor of Specialization;
- 2) send the thesis for revision (except for cases of thesis defense in the form of a series of articles);
- 3) refuse to award the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) or Doctor of Specialization.

Copies of the reviews of the official reviewers are handed over to the doctoral student no later than 5 (five) working days before the defense of the thesis.

Official Reviewer:

RSE "Temirbek Zhurgenov Kazakh National Academy of Arts" of the MCI RK
 Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Acting Associate Professor
 Department of Foreign Languages and APK

(place of work, academic title)


 (signature)

Zhalalova Akshay Malsutolovna
 (FULL NAME)

