

Bachelor's thesis review

Thesis title: The role of Extraversion and Introversion in Second Language Classroom Behaviour among young Adult Learners

Author: Iryna Rozinko

Supervisor: PhDr. Gabriela Seidlová Málková, Ph.D.

This thesis explores the possible role of personality traits of second language learners to their language classroom behaviour. It is formally structured into two parts, theoretical and empirical one. The thesis project was prepared, constructed and later also conducted as an individual small scale research project resulting from the interest of the student. The student actually provides the revised version of the bachelor theses submitted in the winter semester.

The theoretical part of the theses concentrates on defining a notion of personality in psychology, especially the distinction of so called extroversion and introversion. The key theoretical aspect for this theses – review on the current state of knowledge on the role of extroversion and introversion (resp. personality) in second language learning is only covered in chapter 2. 4. (in fact 6 pages). Also, the text in this chapter covers mainly the role of extroversion in the second language learning (and not so much on introversion). The reader mentions necessarily, that most of the sources cited here are not recent, more typically more than 15 years old. I find this fact not ideal, it certainly makes the content of this chapter weak and not very useful for interpreting data from the empirical part. Referencing is not precise; sometimes it looks like the reference is missing at all (for example p. 11, second paragraph), some references provide very specific claim (paraphrase) but do not specify pages in the original source (for example p. 12, second paragraph), some references seem to be missing (for example p. 16, second paragraph).

The empirical part is a report on short, pilot study conducted through the one month of 2016. Fifteen students were assessed by personality screening test to differentiate extroversion /introversion personalities. Later, the group (covering both personality subgroups) was followed in the second language classes to describe possible differences in classroom behaviour of students showing extroverted or introverted tendencies throughout the screening test. Both personality subgroups were later characterized by their answers provided in the classroom behaviour questionnaire and throughout the structured observation procedures. The students aims to find out ...“how do students (extroverts and introverts) differentiate in second language classroom behaviour and attitude to learning activities...“. Methodology section chapter structure is slightly confusing: chapter names do not fully correspond to its content (participants partially described in Design, Procedures partially described in Participants, Procedures mentioned in Techniques...) . The data collected are described in the chapter Results. Both personality subgroups are described and defined by the means of frequency. The key data on possible differences between the personality subgroups are actually provided on p. 25-33 , being very descriptive. The interpreting / analytical parts are almost missing. For the defence, I ask the student to prepare answers or explanations to these questions /comments:

1. Explain the Graph 1: What does this graph says in relation to the research question provided on page 19? What are the data showing here? Isn't it just confirming the way the questionnaire was constructed?
2. Where are the raw data related to the description on p. 31 and Graph 1?

3. Explain Graph 2 in a detail. What does the content of this graph mean in relation to the research question provided on p. 19?
4. How is the “significance” of differences between both personality subgroups provided/measured? (+ also explain third paragraph on p. 32).
5. Where are the raw data related to the Graph 3 presented?

Despite the weaknesses at the level of formal aspects, content coherence and the clarity of the research results, I consider this thesis to be acceptable for the defence procedure. I recommend careful preparation of the project presentation for the defence speech. I propose the grading good.

Gabriela Seidlová Málková

Hostivice, 5. 6. 2017