



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: Suzanne Lewis, MA

Reviewed as: a supervisor an opponent

Author of the thesis: Daniela Šnýdrová

Title of the thesis: Occurrence of speech disfluencies in teacher English of native Czech speakers and native English speakers.

Year of submission: 2024

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

Strong points of the thesis:

- Comprehensive and detailed theoretical section.
- Interesting points raised in 2.1.2 regarding issues aside from learner ability affecting fluency and proficiency, and in 2.2.2 about self-corrections, and how a lack of accent mitigates the impact of self-corrections.
- Case study used in 2.3.1 pertinent to thesis research, as are the studies presented in 2.3.2-2.3.4
- Good use of sources, citation and referencing throughout.
- Use of an original data set.
- Explanation for data in 3.2 clear and logical.
- Overall, analysis section very detailed and results well presented in tables.
- Interesting results discussed on page 36, similar to Gráf's findings (2017) that fluency and disfluencies are often speaker-specific and very individual, making it difficult to assess.
- Limitations of study clearly described and explained in the conclusion.

Minor issues

- Informal register.
- Issues with grammar and coherence in places.
- Aim of study seems to draw an obvious conclusion regarding non-native speakers producing more disfluencies in general.
- Some sections overly reliant on a single source (e.g. 2.1 – 2.2.3 cites Williams (2022) > 20 times.
- Unclear in section 2.2.1. where the 4 most numerous categories of repetitions are described – the 4 categories are not clearly outlined. (p.13)

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

1. Why did you have more Czech speakers than native speakers in your analysis? It made quite a difference in terms of tokens (approx. 76000 vs 32000) and results (220 v 63) and you highlight this on page 33 as a reason why we cannot tell if the results mean anything. Could you not have reduced the number of Czech participants to match the number of native English speakers? Or was it not possible to source more data from native English speakers?
2. You state in the introduction that you are '*convinced that increased interest in teacher language can be beneficial for both the teacher community and the public*' as it would raise awareness to this subject. Can you explain in more detail of the benefits you see in this?
3. Can you explain what you mean when you write in section 2.1.1. '*[I]nterruptions [...] can be useful because they [...] may reveal the personal identity of the speaker or some psychological factors*'.



FACULTY OF ARTS
Charles University

Department of English and ELT Methodology

4. In 2.3.1 you used a case study to show how task complexity affects fluency. Results showed that complex tasks both increased errors (e.g. pronunciation) and reduced them (few grammatical/lexical) due to higher attention levels given. How might this information be useful for EFL teachers?

Proposed grade:

excellent very good good fail

Place, date and signature of the reviewer:

Prague, 27.08.2024

Suzanne Lewis, MA