

“ELPAC Testing and Real ATC Language Use”

Author: Magdaléna Přivorová

This thesis is a very interesting one. It compares the ELPAC English test that air traffic controllers must take every three or five years (depending on one's results) with the English phraseology actually used by them at their work-places.

The great thing about this thesis is that it comes to practical conclusions and offers possible solutions. The author of the thesis, Magdaléna Přivorová, concludes that the ELPAC test uses phraseology that not all *types* (i.e., en route, tower, approach) of ATCs might be familiar with, so scores on the test could be unfairly lower for those ATCs who do not work with said phraseology. The solution suggested by Ms. Přivorová – that the setting and conditions of the test should be more realistic in order to get an accurate picture of the ATC's English language skills is an important and good one.

It would have been nice to see some analysis of the second task of ELPAC Paper 2 (the picture description and interview). This is not really a criticism, as Bc. theses are not meant to be overly long, and Ms. Přivorová addresses that it is outside the scope of her thesis (page 14). However, it is also mentioned on page 6 that one goal of testing is to check that ATCs have the ability to deal with non-routine situations – set phrases might only go so far in an emergency – so it would be interesting to see what one of the more general English parts of test is like. Maybe this could be an area for further research.

Some errors in language usage (there were others, i.e., word order):

Page 1: tens of them

Page 9: makes problems

Page 14 + 17: incorrect punctuation: inverted commas

Page 16 + 26: a lot of: too informal in academic writing

Page 17: boarders for borders.

Page 19 + 21: rate of descend

Also, there is too much use of the pronoun *he* when referring to ATCs and pilots. In the year 2013, either he/she or pluralizing would be a better approach, even if these professions are still largely male-dominated.

This thesis is well-organized and easy to read and understand, with relatively few errors in language usage. It is also well researched and on a worthy topic.

**Recommended Grade: 1 (Výborně)**

**Mark Farrell, June 2013**