



FACULTY OF ARTS
Charles University

Department of English and ELT Methodology

A Review of a Final Thesis
submitted to the Department of English and ELT Methodology,
Faculty of Arts, Charles University

Name and titles of the reviewer: Suzanne Lewis, MA

Reviewed as: a supervisor an opponent

Author of the thesis: Aneta Formanová

Title of the thesis: *Glottalization patterns in the L2 speech of Czech and Slovak speakers of English*

Year of submission: 2023

Submitted as: a bachelor's thesis a master's thesis

Level of expertise:

excellent very good average below average inadequate

Factual errors:

almost none appropriate to the scope of the thesis frequent less serious serious

Chosen methodology:

original and appropriate appropriate barely adequate inadequate

Results:

original original and derivative non-trivial compilation cited from sources copied

Scope of the thesis:

too large appropriate to the topic adequate inadequate

Bibliography (number and selection of titles):

above average (scope or rigor) average below average inadequate

Typographical and formal level:

excellent very good average below average inadequate

Language:

excellent very good average below average inadequate

Typos:

almost none appropriate to the scope of the thesis numerous



Overall evaluation of the thesis:

excellent very good average below average inadequate

Strong points of the thesis:

- Extensive theoretical section, with many examples to support ideas.
- Study organised logically.
- Good application of theory to posit practical explanations as to why Czech and Slovak speakers may struggle with devoicing and voiceless aspects in 2.5.3
- Good use of figures and tables in 3. Method section and 4. Results
- Clear description of labelling 3.3 and data extraction 3.4
- Results clearly described.
- Discussion describes some factors which could explain any unexpected outcomes.

Weak points of the thesis:

- Research only conducted using female participants, with no explanation as to why. It was not presented in the title or the abstract.
- Not an overly challenging/original hypothesis – simply an observation. Also based on a relatively obvious proposition that Czechs and Slovaks will differ from native speakers in glottalization.
- Confusing examples given in the theoretical section e.g.
 - where you state ‘the silent ‘r’ can only materialize..after certain vowel endings...**two of which** can be seen in the examples 8 and 9’. Example 8 is actually an example where it does **NOT** appear, but the reader only finds this out later.
 - An asparagus / ten asparagus – only later is it clear that the use of ‘ten’ is Czech.
 - 2.1.2 examples 9 and 10 appear mixed up or missing (idiot/hinduista)
 - 2.3 from example 5 - 12 the numbers do not match the reference in the text.
 - Seems a little contradictory in 2.4 in the paragraph about linking and glottalization. ‘glottal stops..serve as a distraction from the information....Glottalizaion may be used to make an utterance more clear’.
 - Also contradictory in 2.5.3 ‘despite the many different [features] that Czech and Slovak share, rules of voicing assimilation[...]differ’.
- The discussion of the use of glottal stop in various languages other than Czech/Slovak/English did not seem relevant to the study.
- It seems that participants assessed their own language level, which could lead to inaccurate results.
- Frequent grammatical/punctuation errors, but not impeding understanding.
- Some literature used not referenced.



FACULTY OF ARTS
Charles University

Department of English and ELT Methodology

Questions to answer during the Defence and suggested points of discussion:

- Why did you only use female participants in your research, and why was this not a part of your title or mentioned in the abstract?
- Do you think your claim in 4.3 that 'the original hypothesis has been confirmed' is possible without any data on males?
- In 2.2 you cite Volín's point that Czech women use glottalization more than men. What do you think is the explanation for this finding?
- Could you give more information/evidence/examples about why Cruttenden claims '*the intrusive r is often deemed undesirable in speech and many people try to avoid it*'. Do you agree with this statement?
- In 2.6 you state that when a person starts to learn a second language, it is very typical that their accent differs from a native speaker's, and that '*vowels in English are different from those in Czech and those are different from vowels in Slovak*'. Regarding the vowels in English, did you take into consideration regional differences in native English speakers' pronunciation when comparing to Czechs or Slovaks, or did you base your study on RP. If you only chose RP, why?

Proposed grade:

excellent very good good fail

Place, date and signature of the reviewer:

Prague, 25.08.2023

Suzanne Lewis, MA