



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:** Iva Hubáčková

**Title of the thesis:** Teaching English to Learners with Special Educational Needs at Higher Elementary School

**Year of submission:** 2020

**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

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

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

This thesis investigates teachers' "knowledge, opinions and strategies" in relation to special needs education in the Czech Republic. The thesis is well written, informative and engaging.

**Strong points of the thesis:**

The thesis is in general of good quality. I selected a few sections where I felt the writing was particularly effective:

Page 12. Very clear introduction

Page 13. Good scope narrowing and rationale

Page 59. Good choice of tests

Page 62. Good for having a section on participants

Page 84. Good for having a section on participants (study 2)

Page 105. Nice summary of the findings

**Weak points of the thesis:**

I was initially surprised by the mixed methodology (interview + survey). While the survey seems complete and it stands on its own, the interviews with the teachers (the first part) have some weaknesses. It is a small sample, and the methodology chosen does not seem to support a study-case approach. I was then explained that initially the student intended to attend these teachers' classes and make an observational study of their methods, but this plan had to be interrupted because of Covid. I believe the thesis would have been perfectly solid with the survey only, but I do understand that the student did not want to waste the data she already collected with the interviews.

I find the choice of the graphs not always effective. Graphs should help deliver the message, but the graphs in this thesis are often rather difficult to read. Some examples:

Page 85. Having a stacked bar chart makes sense only if the sum of each column is different. A grouped bar chart would have made more sense here.

Page 87. I am not sure I understand this graph, if we have time at the defence, I'd appreciate you explaining it.

Page 95. Are these box plots? Does that mean that you often have quartiles overlapping with the median (hence there is "no box")?



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

I put my questions in order of importance:

At page 15, you mention that estimates of the prevalence of SpLD can vary between 5 and 15%. What makes the concept of prevalence in developmental disorders a problematic issue? (Check your notes from the language acquisition class, it is something we discussed).

Page 93-94. Here you make an interesting attempt at including a big chunk of your data in one model using regression(s). So, what was the model that you finally ran? it is good practice to mention the dependent variable and the list of predictors when you have a large model.

Page 66 (see also page 81...): Here you mention that one teacher views positively the separation of some cases into special needs schools. This topic is heavily influenced by personal views (not necessarily by experience), and this can skew your data in such a small sample. I would appreciate if you discussed this issue and how (if) you think it affected in your study.

Page 92. There are two p that are not significant, but you say that they are significant. Check please.

**Other comments:**

This is an interesting study with relevant practical applications, I believe the candidate did an excellent job and I propose a grade one.

**Proposed grade:**

excellent  very good  good  fail

Place, date and signature of the reviewer:

Prague, 10-6-2020

*Lucia Chubáková*