



Katedra anglického jazyka a literatury

Posudek vedoucí/oponenta diplomové/bakalářské/závěrečné práce KAJL UHK

Autor práce : Müllerova Pavla

Studijní obor : Učitelství pro 1. stupeň základní školy


Forma studia : Prezenční

Název práce : *Teaching English at Primary School Level in an Enjoyable Way*

Vedoucí práce : Ježdíková Vladimíra, Mgr. Ph.D.

Oponent práce : Gamze Korbek, Ph.D.

Kritéria hodnocení práce	Hodnocení A - F
Obsahová stránka	C
Formulace cílů práce	C
Vhodnost využití primárních a sekundárních zdrojů pro podporu argumentace	B
Rozsah a hloubka vlastní analýzy, kritický přístup ke zdrojům	D
Interpretace dat a splnění cílů práce	D
Formální stránka	C
Logická struktura práce	B
Úroveň jazykového zpracování	B
Dodržení bibliografických norem	C
Komentáře k hodnocení General Comments The <i>formal organization</i> of the work is average. The core of the theoretical framework is presented in very broad terms. When it comes to foreign language education, it's critical to go through the four skills which was outlined by the author in depth. Despite the fact that she addresses each skill separately, she neglects to include a foreign language teaching approach when discussing the activity design. There are citation errors throughout the thesis where the author mentions authors' first names (e.g., Penny Ur on page 24) or constant mentioning of page numbers for all the citations even though it is not necessary (e.g., Pinter, 2006, p. 13; Dunn, 1983, p. 1 etc.). The second half of the thesis, 'Effective and Enjoyable Teaching,' is discussed, but the word 'effective' is used for the first time, making it difficult to understand the diploma thesis's goal (page 25). Definitions of these terms could help clarify the author's argument and goal, allowing for a discussion of the contribution to the field. The practical part of the study is well-designed even though it lacks the connection of theory and the empirical material. It also lacks how the description of teachers' characteristics and teaching styles were observed. Neither the author states the problem nor defines the topic or the focus of her study clearly while constructing the hypothesis. (e.g., Hypothesis: I expect the activities are enjoyable, suitable, effective for pupils, and the actual content is practiced by them, on page 38).	



The author used a mixed method design for the study, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches without citing literature and failing to disclose the data analysis. (For example, the outcomes of both quantitative and qualitative methods are presented and compared in further depth in the following chapter, on page 43). She claims that she chose observation for qualitative data collecting, yet there is no observation grid included in the appendices.

Within the analysis section, the author explains each activity in detail and shares teacher and student results with the explanations and demonstrations of bar charts. Throughout the data analysis 'the effectiveness of the activities' was mentioned instead of their enjoyability (e.g., ...this activity was effective for practicing and pupils were active, page, 62), and for the conclusion the aim of the research was stated in another form as 'whether the activities are effective for practicing the content of the set topic' (page, 83).

Despite the above-mentioned deficiencies, errors and suggestions for improvement, the author proved to be able to work with scholar resources and literature and to carry out a study. I appreciate the effort made in linking the research methods since it is not an easy task for a beginner-researcher.

To conclude, the diploma thesis meets the requirements and is ready for its defense.

Otázky k obhajobě

How did you address the teachers to find out about their characteristics?

Are traditional teaching approaches capable of delivering enjoyable or effective content learning? Why/Why not?

V Hradci Králové

dne

autor posudku

4 May 2022

Gamze Korbek, Ph.D



Univerzita Hradec Králové
Pedagogická fakulta