



FACULTY OF ARTS  
Charles University

Department of English and ELT Methodology

# A Review of a Final Thesis

submitted to the Department of English and ELT Methodology,  
Faculty of Arts, Charles University

Name and titles of the reviewer: Luca Cilibrasi, PhD

Reviewed as:  a supervisor  an opponent

Author of the thesis:

Title of the thesis:

Year of submission: 2019

Submitted as:  a bachelor's thesis  a master's thesis

Level of expertise:

excellent  very good  average  below average  inadequate

Factual errors:

almost none  appropriate to the scope of the thesis  frequent less serious  serious

Chosen methodology:

original and appropriate  appropriate  barely adequate  inadequate

Results:

original  original and derivative  non-trivial compilation  cited from sources  copied

Scope of the thesis:

too large  appropriate to the topic  adequate  inadequate

Bibliography (number and selection of titles):

above average (scope or rigor)  average  below average  inadequate

Typographical and formal level:

excellent  very good  average  below average  inadequate

Language:

excellent  very good  average  below average  inadequate

Typos:

almost none  appropriate to the scope of the thesis  numerous

Overall evaluation of the thesis:

excellent  very good  average  below average  inadequate



FACULTY OF ARTS  
Charles University

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:***

*This thesis investigates the relation between productive and perceived fluency in a dataset of 25 advanced speakers of English with Czech as L1. The thesis deals with an interesting topic and it is detailed and thorough in most parts. The theoretical background is outstanding and it offers ample explanations on the possible definitions available for the problems raised, and also on the choices made by the candidate on how to deal with these problems. The analysis is simple but effective (sometimes less is more, good). I also appreciated the inclusion of possible implications of the findings for teaching, and also the inclusion of a very fair section on the limitations of the study.*

***Weak points of the thesis:***

*The thesis has an overall logical structure, but research questions are presented unusually after methods (they normally belong to the theoretical background). The first sentence of the research questions section is a beautiful summary of the intentions of the thesis: "The present study aims to examine the relation between perceived fluency as rated by non-expert native speaker judges and productive fluency in the form of one of the objective temporal measures, namely speech rate.". I believe this sentence could have been the opening sentence of your introduction (or maybe of your abstract, where you state something similar but less neatly), with the rest of the section on RQ at the end of the introduction.*

*The analysis completely lacks graphs (with the exception of a histogram reporting each speaker's fluency) and is not generous with tables (for example, descriptive statistics are missing). It is common to present scatter-plots when reporting correlations/regressions, and it is also useful to include trend lines, especially when correlations/regressions are significant but medium or weak, to give a feeling of the direction of your effects.*



.....  
FACULTY OF ARTS  
Charles University

Department of English and ELT Methodology

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

*I would really appreciate if you created 5 scatter-plots, one for each rater, and you brought them to the defence. On one axis you should put the listener's ratings, while on the other the productive fluency scores. Include trend lines. It would be good to look at these during the defence.*

*Have you considered averaging the ratings of the 5 listeners and correlating this average with the productive fluency scores? What result do you get in this way?*

**Other comments:**

**Proposed grade:**

excellent  very good  good  fail

Place, date and signature of the reviewer:

Prague, 1-09-2019

*Anna Černá*