



## Katedra anglického jazyka a literatury

### Posudek vedoucího bakalářské práce KAJL UHK

<b>Autor práce</b>	<b>Martin Sehnoutka</b>
<b>Studijní obor</b>	Anglický jazyk se zaměřením na vzdělávání / Společenské vědy se zaměřením na vzdělání
<b>Forma studia</b>	Prezenční
<b>Název práce</b>	Testing Interaction: Evidence for L2 Interactional Competence during an Oral Exam from General English
<b>Vedoucí práce</b>	Mgr. David Ryška
<b>Oponent práce</b>	Mgr. Vladimíra Ježdíková, Ph.D.

Kritéria hodnocení práce	Hodnocení A - F
<b>Obsahová stránka</b>	
Formulace cílů práce	B
Vhodnost využití primárních a sekundárních zdrojů pro podporu argumentace	B
Rozsah a hloubka vlastní analýzy, kritický přístup ke zdrojům	A
Interpretace dat a splnění cílů práce	A
<b>Formální stránka</b>	
Logická struktura práce	C
Úroveň jazykového zpracování	D
Dodržení bibliografických norem	C

Mr. Sehnoutka's BA thesis deals with the much relevant issue of testing L2 interactional competence, here in the context of an oral proficiency exam from General English taken by university students at our faculty. Building on the now much attested claim that such exam formats often fail to consider the skills necessary for managing talk-in-interaction, and using the method of multimodal Conversation Analysis to analyse the moment-by-moment unfolding of students' conduct during one of the discussion tasks, Mr. Sehnoutka's original intention was to identify features relevant for the assessment of L2 interactional competence. Nevertheless, as he was progressing in his analysis, he later realised that what his data contain has rather implications for the design of the test task itself. Hence the two main findings of his thesis: that the task often fails to elicit any interaction whatsoever because of the way the instructions are written and delivered, and that when there is interaction between the students, it is often hindered by the excessive visual orientation to the worksheet.



First and foremost, it should be acknowledged that to address the topic of his thesis, Mr. Sehnoutka had to make himself familiar with the procedures of multimodal Conversation Analysis, a method which is not at all covered at his level of studies and which has a significantly steep learning curve. Yet it is here where I believe the thesis is at its strongest as the depth of the analysis exceeds what we usually see from linguistic BA theses at our department.

Unfortunately, there are also times when the author struggles to fulfil what is expected from such work: the review of literature is somewhat brief; the quotes and paraphrases are awkwardly introduced; sometimes there is a lack of coherence between the paragraphs, for example in the Methods Section; the Discussion does not always adequately address the issues raised in the review of literature. Finally, the reader can't help but think that the writing of the thesis was somewhat rushed and needed an extra round of editing and proofreading: too often can one encounter missing full stops, repeating propositions and references, or grammar mistakes.

Nevertheless, having seen the amount of time Mr. Sehnoutka had to invest into making himself familiar with the method, transcribing the data, and putting together the analysis, I more than believe that the thesis should be recommended for defence with the mark

C

#### ***Otázky k obhajobě***

1. One of the author's important findings is that students' excessive orientation to the worksheet hinders opportunities for interaction and should therefore ideally be reduced. However, I wonder what stance the author holds on the role of material artifacts in testing "real-life" interaction; shouldn't the test task design reflect the fact that human conduct is often structured around items such as notes, agendas, textbooks, and so on?