Oponentní posudek bakalářské práce

Autor/ka BP:	**Radislav Šplíchal**
Název práce:	**Využití ICT ve výuce anglické výslovnosti / Using ICT for English Pronunciation Teaching**
Oponent/ka:	**Mgr. Zénó Vernyik, Ph.D.**

Hodnotící kritéria	Splňuje bez výhrad	Splňuje s drobnými výhradami	Splňuje s výhradami	Nesplňuje
A. Obsahová				
V práci jsou vymezeny základní a dílčí cíle, které jsou v koncepci práce patřičně rozpracovány. Cíle jsou adekvátně naplňovány.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Práce splňuje cíle zadání.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Studující využívá a kriticky vybírá primární a/nebo sekundární literaturu.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Práce má vymezen předmět, je využito odpovídajících metodologických postupů.	☒	☐	☐	☐
Výstupy výzkumných částí jsou adekvátně syntetizovány a je o nich diskutováno.	☒	☐	☐	☐
V práci je využita odborná terminologie a jsou vysvětleny hlavní pojmy.	☐	☒	☐	☐
V práci jsou formulovány jasné závěry, které se vztahují ke koncepci práce a ke stanoveným cílům.	☒	☐	☐	☐
B. Formální				
Práce vykazuje standardní poznámkový aparát a jednotný způsob citací v rámci práce, je typograficky jednotná.	☐	☒	☐	☐
Studující dodržuje jazykovou normu, text je stylisticky jednotný.	☐	☒	☐	☐
Text je soudržný, srozumitelný a argumentačně podložený.	☐	☒	☐	☐
C. Přínos práce [*]	☒	☐	☐	☐

Slovní hodnocení práce:

Mr Šplíchal's bachelor's thesis is the analysis of the process of creating and introducing a complex and comprehensive e-learning course, as well as radically redesigning the teaching methods of the course Phonetics and Phonology 1 (FO1BE), as well as a discussion of the experience of using it for the first time in practice.

As such, the final text is based on work which is significantly more ambitious and challenging than one would accept at this level. Mr Šplíchal's work included the recording of hundreds of listening samples, the creation of myriads of self-evaulating test questions beyond and above the usual tasks of processing theoretical texts and analysing certain phenomena. Beyond doubt, the candidate has significantly contributed to the development of the teaching curriculum at the English Department and the improvement of the student experience for generations to come.

At the same time, I cannot help noticing some minor shortcomings of the thesis itself: there are frequent albeit minor language mistakes (missing or incorrect articles, issues with relative clauses - i.e. p. 44, 44 -, or concordance) and occasional issues with style (contracted forms, phrasal verbs and idioms) and citation, and there are parts of the thesis where it is not immediately apparent how and if they support the paper's main line of argument. Also, the paper's research methods are not always without potential flaws (see questions below).

All in all, however, the works's strengths detail above far outweigh its technical drawbacks, and I am thus happy to recommend an excellent grade.

Práce splňuje požadavky na udělení akademického titulu Bc.:	**ANO**
Práci doporučuji k obhajobě:	**ANO**
Návrh klasifikačního stupně:	**výborně**

Náměty pro obhajobu:

1) You based your conclusion about the changes being positive and the course being successful on course observation and the analysis of questionnaires only. There is no control group that would have been taught the same content using the previous forms and methods only. This significantly hinders the objectivity and reliability of your findings. For example, you yourself mention that only 56 of the 97 participants filled in the questionnaire, and those that did might well be the successful ones only. That in itself means very distorted results. But further, one could also mention that as the classes were only observed by yourself and Ms Karásková and you were both involved in the redesign of the course, you clearly had strong expectations that might have influenced what you saw in the classroom. Likewise, people tend to agree that a new method is useful if they are directly used such a question (the question itself suggests the answer). How would you redesign your research (i.e. not the course) with these comments in mind?

2) You claim that the fact that only 22% of students were satisfied with the amount of extra materials and optional content means that they would like more such content. Can this not also mean that they would like less?

3) You claim that the FO1BE course is the only one at the Faculty of Science, Humanities and Education with "materials prepared specifically for e-learning" which is a rather bold statement. Do you have any specific proof that this is the case?

Datum: 23.08.2017   Podpis: _____