

FACULTY OF ARTS Charles University

The second second second		
BURNTODS STORY	Department of English and ELT	Г Methodology
	submitted to the Department	a Final Thesis t of English and ELT Methodology, , Charles University
Name and titles o Reviewed as:	f the reviewer: Suzanne Lewis,	MA 🖂 an opponent
		lish prosodic features in Czech children
Submitted as:		is \Box a master's thesis
Level of expertise \Box excellent \boxtimes v	: ery good □ average □ below	v average □ inadequate
Factual errors: ⊠ almost none [\square appropriate to the scope of the scope o	he thesis 🛛 frequent less serious 🔲 serious
Chosen methodol ⊠ original and ap	l ogy: propriate □ appropriate □ b	oarely adequate 🛛 inadequate
Results: □ original ⊠ ori	ginal and derivative 🛛 non-triv	vial compilation 🛛 cited from sources 🔲 copied
Scope of the thesi □ too large ⊠ ap	is: ppropriate to the topic □ adeq	juate 🗆 inadequate
Bibliography (number and selection of titles): ⊠ above average (scope or rigor) □ average □ below average □ inadequate		
Typographical and \square excellent \square v	d formal level: ery good □ average □ below	v average 🛛 inadequate
Language: \Box excellent \boxtimes v	ery good 🛛 average 🗆 below	vaverage □ inadequate
Typos: ⊠ almost none [\Box appropriate to the scope of the scope o	he thesis 🛛 numerous
Overall evaluation of the thesis:		

 \Box excellent \boxtimes very good \Box average \Box below average \Box inadequate



Department of English and ELT Methodology

Brief description of the thesis (by the supervisor, ca. 100-200 words):

Review, comments and notes (ca. 100-200 words)

Strong points of the thesis:

- Comprehensive theoretical section, (chapter 2) with features of prosody, intonation and rhythm clearly outlined and defined.
- Good overview of terms, especially the description of prosody and intonation
- Well supported statements in section 2.1 on Intonation
- Excellent discussion in Chapter 3, good synthesis of arguments.
- Good analysis and conclusion on pp30-31 regarding at which age to start teaching prosodic features.

Weak points of the thesis:

- Small test group for the empirical research, and only one teaching method explored.
- Results section a little short.
- Grammatical issues with articles, and some sentences lacking cohesion/coherence. Use of less formal phrases.

Questions to answer during the Defence and suggested points of discussion:

- On p.15 you state that 'yes' or 'no' are rarely said with a level tone, and do not sound natural. Can you think of a reason why a speaker might naturally use a level tone for 'yes' or 'no'?
- On p20 you write 'even though it might seem trivial' when discussing linking. Why do you think linking might seem trivial? You didn't mention this about any other features of speech.
- How could the control group of students be expected to produce the target sentences on p.39, based on seeing flash cards, if they had had no prior practice with this chanting activity?
- For your empirical research, you choose 1 taught group vs 1 control group to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching English prosodic features. Can you explain your rationale behind this decision?

Proposed grade:

 \Box excellent \boxtimes very good \Box good \Box fail

Place, date and signature of the reviewer: *Prague*, 27th August 2018