

Hodnocení navr. oponentem bad. pr.: velmi dobře  
Hodnocení navrhované vedoucím bakalářské práce: výborně minus

**Průběh obhajoby bakalářské práce:**

Anežka Adamcová started the defence of her B.A. thesis "Discrimination of English Phonemes Based on Minimal Pairs by Young Learners" by briefly describing the structure of her presentation of the BA. She presented the aims of the BA, explained the inner structure of the theoretical and practical parts (support for the practical part, methods and approaches, age, focus, finding minimal pairs from three problematic groups, etc.).

Preparation: finding place (kindergarten) choosing minimal pair, finding pictures, printing and cutting, preparing lesson structures, testing, finding methods – she decided to choose the Silent Period method. Next she moved on to answering Reader 2's question stating that – for her it was important that they perceive the language, not important. It is also important for her to evaluate every lesson as well as herself – if everything went correctly and if she was meeting her goals. She then modified her following lessons whenever necessary.

However, there were some problems with choosing the kindergarten as there were different conditions – she said she had had to adjust preparation because of the shorter attention span of the children, also they were too young to work with. Despite these issues, she performed the testing. She then described the two testing lessons in more detail (lessons 4 and 9).

When answering the question, Miss Adamcová stated that she already gave her answer in the presentation, which she effectively did. As far as the next question about teaching pronunciation not being very popular among teachers, Miss Adamcová's answer was that in her opinion this was for lack of experience as well as that of education. She also mentioned that her teacher did not have much experience with pronunciation, either. She next claimed there never was much time for pronunciation, rather for grammatical structures, etc. This is where Dr Vernyik stepped in, asking whether there was a possibility to integrate pronunciation in other kinds of exercises. Miss Adamcová said that they were always corrected, but never had a systematic training.

Dr Marková: Do you think your lack of experience affected the results of your research? When collecting data, how much of your input was in it? Miss Adamcová answered she had been trying to explain, but she had recording of the words from dictionaries, so it was proper pronunciation. She is aware she does not pronounce everything correctly.

When asked Question 3 (what she would have done differently), she would have liked to have the lessons more often, ideally once a week and not once in two weeks like it happened. Seeing the children more often would have made the learning process easier. Regarding the testing, she would have preferred to examine them individually as it would be easier for them to focus.

Question 4: If you were to pursue a similar topic in the future, what specifically would you be interested in researching and why? Miss Adamcová answered she would be interested to do a similar research with other age groups. She would try to compare the results, in teenagers and younger adults and thinks it might be interesting to see whether preschool children are really learning so fast and if it is the ideal age to start with learning English.

The committee started the assessment process: Dr Vernyik said an A minus and a B were suggested and there is not much disagreement between those. Dr Vernyik then asked the second reader, Mgr. Čanecký, whether he thought Miss Adamcová was convincing, whether she answers given by the student were sufficient. Mgr. Čanecký replied that Miss Adamcová did not mention one important issue: the problem in consistency of the testing. Sometimes she tested students who had no idea what was being tested. Dr Vernyik said she did mention that.

Mr. Čanecký then mentioned that Miss Adamcová devoted 5 or 6 subchapters to pure description, which was completely unnecessary.

Dr Haupt then confirmed that the student's performance did look convincing. Dr Vernyik noted that it is necessary to praise a very positive approach of the authors. Dr Vernyik then concluded that the defence was convincing and the student should be given the higher grade of the two proposed.

Klasifikace: výborně minus

Datum obhajoby: 6. 9. 2022

.....

předseda zkušební komise