# 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:** Daniela Marková
**Title of the thesis:**

**Year of submission:** 2023
**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):

The thesis presents a purposely developed interactive graded reader and it examines its success in teaching a selection of infrequent English words to primary school children. The thesis is composed of an extensive theoretical part dealing with language learning issues, a thorough methodological section dealing with the development of the graded reader, a description of the experimental part where the assessments of the reader's validity is measured in contrasts to a more classic version of the graded reader, and finally a section discussing the results.

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

Ms Markova demonstrates to be able to master a variety of skills and put them together at the service of original research. In this thesis, the student developed the storyline for the graded reader, then created an interactive version to be used on pcs, and finally tested two groups of children to understand whether the interactive version would be more successful than a traditional paper one. This original research work is in combination with solid theoretical foundations and understandings of the problems of language acquisition.

***Strong points of the thesis:***

I believe the strongest element of this work is its originality. Ms Markova managed to creatively address a relevant problem in language acquisition and produce a research project that blends technology, writing skills and psycholinguistics methods. This originality is a promising feature of Ms Markova's profile as a researcher, something that could serve her well in the upcoming years of graduate school.

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

The main weakness of the thesis lies in the theoretical background. The first section of the thesis is in fact extensive, but this comes with a price. Not all sections appear to be fully relevant, and this is true despite a quite intensive work conducted to reorganise and make sense of all the studies presented. In the future, it may be useful for Ms Markova to choose a more limited set of theories and authors to use as a baseline for her work, and make sure that her research fills specific gaps in the literature of choice. I would like to stress that, while this is indeed a limitation because it partly compromises the flow of the thesis, it is also true that the problem is secondary. The theoretical background is still solid and covers what needs to be covered, it only could have been more focussed.

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

As you pointed out in the final part of your thesis, the two groups differ in two ways: first, one group used a paper version of the task and the other used a digital version of the task. Second, only the computer version had adaptive features. Can you expand on how this issue may have potentially affected your results?

What would you do differently if you were to run the study again?

*Other comments:*

The candidate did an excellent job with this thesis and I propose grade 1.

**Proposed grade:**
☒ excellent   ☐ very good   ☐ good   ☐ fail


Place, date and signature of the reviewer:
*Prague, 26-08-2023*