



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:** Mgr. Lucie Jiráňková, Ph.D.

**Reviewed as:**  a supervisor  an opponent

**Author of the thesis:** Lenka Kalvodová

**Title of the thesis:** *Production and perception aspects of weak form words in Czech-accented English*

**Year of submission:** 2021

**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)

**Strong points of the thesis:** The presented bachelor thesis focuses both on the production and perception of weak forms words, covering a larger spectre of aspects than if it focused on only one of these areas. The thesis is logically structured, paragraphs are clearly connected, arguments easy to follow. The admirable flow of the text results in an easy read. The formal structure of the thesis is definitely one of its many highlights. I especially support the author's decision to separate the production and perception analytical chapters into two due to the difference in methodology that would make reading and understanding much more difficult were it handled in one uniform methodology chapter. The theoretical framework provides sufficient information for the further practical analysis of the collected data. The hypotheses are clearly stated and worked with in the course of the thesis. The author also provides direct exemplifications of selected theoretical aspects, which makes understanding very easy even for a non-specialist in the field.

I also have to emphasize the methodology, the author's work with the material, and its subsequent analysis. The author made of various programmes and applications in her thesis, mastering (at least basic knowledge) of *Praat*, *P2FA*, *Adobe Audition*, and *R*. She not only manipulated her recordings but also visualized the data using *ggplot2*. The use of the production recordings for the perception tests was a very sensible idea, as well.

The author also had the pedagogical side of the topic in mind and was very aware of the thesis limitations, including even suggestions for further studies.

**Weak points of the thesis:** This is more of a recommendation and suggestion for further work than anything else at this stage of the author's studies; however, for me, one of the greatest limitations of the thesis is the absence of any statistical analysis that would make the results and the author's conclusions even stronger. I realize this is only a bachelor thesis; however, since the author has already uploaded the data into *R*, it might take a minute to run a simple t-test or ANOVA (given parametric tests can be used on the data) to decide whether the difference between the two groups both in the production and the perception part were significant or not. The absence of such clear findings slightly undermines any conclusions derived from the thesis. The author then has to be very careful in wording her conclusions, which she, in my opinion, does rather well.

Another weak point is the number of participants used in each experiment (12+12 for the production experiment and 15+8 in the perception experiment). The study might be potentially underpowered, and it might influence the results. Again, any findings have to be worded very carefully. However, I understand that it must be difficult recruiting people during COVID-19, and the author should be applauded for finding ways to carry out the experiments in such difficult conditions.

The initial disclaimer is not signed, and *NSs* is missing in the list of abbreviations. The first part of the abstract (in both language) rather resembles an introduction chapter than a theoretical overview. The two abstracts also differ in the information on comprehensibility findings (the Czech one correctly states that comprehensibility was more difficult than accentedness, while the English abstract states the opposite). Those are mere details, though.



FACULTY OF ARTS  
Charles University

Department of English and ELT Methodology

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

- What surprised you the most about your thesis or your findings?
- What do you think is the thesis' greatest contribution?
- What are the implications of your thesis for how L2 pronunciation should be taught or for L2 teaching in general?
- How can your thesis be extended to provide more reliable data or even more useful prompts for teaching L2 pronunciation?

**Other comments:** Overall, I was very satisfied with this thesis in terms of its scope, length, material preparation, data analysis and subsequent visualization, and its formal structuring. For a bachelor thesis, the author did a very good job!

**Proposed grade:**

excellent    very good    good    fail

Place, date, and signature of the reviewer:  
Prague, February 1, 2022

*Jirankora*