In her thesis, Lucie Jiránková presents a psycholinguistic study whose purpose is to establish whether processes linked with partial blocking of certain disruptive phonological processes that have been ascertained with native speakers of English are also to be found with non-native speakers of English. As such it extends our knowledge of information processing models within the context of SLA and the way verbs and inflectional morphology are stored in the lexicon. In effect, it provides further evidence to support theories of morpheme stripping. The study is of considerable interest as it works with L2 learners at different levels of proficiency.

The introduction provides an excellent review of relevant literature and key themes. It successfully and very effectively explains the purpose and the context of the study. Somewhat surprising is the relatively detailed inclusion of the thesis' methodology here but the author uses it for the basis of her hypotheses, which are stated directly afterwards. The following chapter provides a concise, well-arranged and well-formulated treatment of the key notions relevant to the research questions. Along with the introduction it makes a convincing account of the author's ability to work with a large body of literature and theoretical concepts and makes a very good and systematic sense of them whilst managing successfully to keep to the topics directly relevant to the actual research.

The methodology and data are meticulously described, in some places perhaps in too much detail. More detail, on the other hand, could have been provided in the descriptive statistics section, where, for example, the table on p. 57 could also have included information about the ranges of the values and could have been accompanied by boxplots so that the reader would get a clearer view of the dispersion of the data. Also lacking is the information about the distribution of the data. The results are presented clearly; I commend the use of inferential statistics and the way the results of the tests are presented. The subsequent discussion shows the author can very well interpret her results and compare them with similar studies.

Comments and questions
– p. 59 – I feel more ought to have been said about Klatt (1975); without it I find it difficult to assess whether 30ms was appropriate in this case and whether it was a proper selection for the involved speaker who made the recording;
– Why were t-tests chosen as as post-hoc tests for ANOVA? Why did you not opt for some of the more common and less problematic alternatives?
– Were there outliers? Would it have been better to choose non-parametric tests?
– What was the distribution of your data. Does it satisfy normality conditions? Why have these not been reported upon?
– Charts in Figs. 4.1–4.6 are not entirely suitable for the presentation of your data. Why did you not use boxplots instead?
– Why did you change the scale of the y-axis in the charts? This way it is misleading as it makes the differences between the charts look larger than they actually are.
– Is it necessary to accompany results which are not significant with charts (e.g. 4.7–4.9)?
– Did you consider the use of regression models for the correlations explored on pp. 63–69?
– To what extent is it possible to assume that different results would have been achieved by multivariate statistical tests?
– Fig. 3.1 is incorrectly labelled as a standard deviation chart whilst it is a value chart.
– The list of non-words on p. 97 contains five examples which are actually words: exs. 12 (nils), 20 (nulls), 34 (Giles), 40 (juls), 71 (jolt).
– Why are all of the non-words monosyllabic? Would the use of polysyllabic words possibly yield different results?
– In Table 7.2 (p. 97) is the heading "Klatese" correct? And in the whole table, is this really the transcription it uses?

**Conclusion**

The author successfully and convincingly manages to fulfil the aim of her thesis. She has shown the ability to organize and make sense of a large body of literature, organize and manage a laborious project involving a large number of people, and last but not least obtain and interpret valid and reliable data. The thesis is written in very sound English and is very well edited (I mark the handful of typos in the printed copy). The above-mentioned comments and questions do not in any way degrade the overall very high standard of the thesis.

I pass the thesis with no corrections for the viva voce and depending on its outcome hereby propose a grade one (výborná).
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