

## Second Reader Evaluation of the Diploma Thesis

### **Khadija Ibrahim: Aims in ELT. A Comparison Study between Yemen and the Czech Republic**

In the diploma thesis the student tries to compare two educational systems from the perspective of aims – general and specific (ELT based). The topic has a potential to bring deep insights into the educational systems of both countries and thus represents a relevant topic for the diploma thesis.

The thesis is divided into two parts, theoretical and practical, the student works with the sufficient amount of literature and critically applies knowledge gained by studying of secondary sources in her paper.

In the theoretical part, the student covers issues related with educational systems of both countries, i.e. she describes the systems and their curricular documents, and focuses on the role of ELT in both systems. The second section of the theoretical part surveys the topic of aims, their role in education, and describes types of aims from the general and subject-specific views. Based on the content analysis of the relevant curricular documents the student intends to identify similarities and differences in general and specific aims of both systems in the practical, research part of the thesis.

Even though the thesis aim was to compare the two educational systems from the selected views, the student did not manage to summarize all the similarities and differences of the systems from the perspective of the aspects she covers in Chapters 2 and 3, and focuses only on some aspects (e.g. on pp. 27-28). Some problems can be also identified in the usage of terminology, e.g. on page 15 the author defines the difference between second and foreign language but on page 27 when talking about the context of ELT in the Czech Republic and European Union she uses the term “second language acquisition”. In the discussion of cognitive aims according to the revised Bloom’s taxonomy, the student does not describe or interpret what the individual cells represent in terms of English language teaching and learning (verbs and nouns that could be used for the description of aims in the individual cells) and thus, consequently, it is very difficult to follow the logic, findings and evidence of her content analysis in which the coding principle used for the process of the analysis is not described at all, not to mention the fact that the author totally ignores the psychomotor domain in her analysis. Also, the sequence of chapters is sometimes incoherent (e.g. the discussion in 8.2.1 could have been related with general aims in Chapter 6).

As far as the language aspect of the thesis is concerned, there occur some language mistakes, e.g. in punctuation (“the Crescent Course for Yemen.Thus”, “i.e., (speaking” - p. 12, “2006” - pp. 24, 28, etc.); in spelling (e.g. p. 14 “Theoritical”, p. 26 “principles”, p. 30 “Dewy”, p. 39 “sex levels”, pp. 43-44 “met cognitive”, etc.); in grammar (e.g. on p. 18 “one the components”, p. 13 “What matters this paper”); in the subject-verb agreement (e.g. on p. 28 “[it] help in achieving”); the sentence on p. 33 is not understandable at all - “This similarly implies in education and one of its key elements.”; etc.

Concerning the formal criteria, the paper is not in full agreement with the stipulated requirements for diploma thesis writing, e.g. the Czech resume is only two pages long, the format of direct quotes longer than three lines does not comply with the requirements, the writer unnecessarily repeats the title of the source on page 11, it is not clear why the student uses brackets in some parts of the text (e.g. p. 12 “under the name of (the General Learning Base, 2002) presents”), theoretical and practical parts should not be numbered as chapters, a

line between paragraphs is missing (e.g. p. 19, 30, 31, 35, 36), there is too big space between paragraphs (e.g. on p. 27); pp. 20, 29, 48 are not numbered, if working with abbreviations/acronyms, it is typical to mention the full term at first and then to refer to the abbreviation/acronym only, not to repeat the full term again (e.g. on pp. 20, 23), numbering subchapters of Chapter 6 does not comply with the requirements (pp. 34-35), Chapter 7.1 is based on one source only, tables used on pp. 42-47 should have been attached as the appendices as well as excerpts from the curricular documents mentioned on pp. 56-84, etc.

**Proposal of issues to be discussed during the diploma thesis defence:**

Based on your theoretical part (Chapter 4 and 6), can you explain what concepts of education are applied in both countries? Based on your theoretical framework, what types of aims can be identified in the curricular documents of both systems? Give examples from the curricular documents, make links with your theoretical standpoints, summarize with the help of tables, graphs, charts, etc.

Why did you choose the revised Bloom's taxonomy as a reference framework in your thesis?

Can you explain the relation between competences according to CEFR and Littlewoods's typology? Why did you choose these two communicative competence models for a theoretical framework in your thesis? Based on them, what types of aims can be identified in the curricular documents in terms of ELT? Give examples from the curricular documents, make links with your theoretical standpoints, summarize with the help of tables, graphs, charts, etc.

On p. 86 you mention "The general aims and the aims of ELT are interconnected" – can you evidence how? Give examples from the documents, make links with your theoretical standpoints, summarize with the help of tables, graphs, charts, etc.

If during the defence the student manages to discuss all the comments and queries mentioned in this evaluation deeply, grounded in the relevant theories, the thesis can be evaluated as follows

**Good (dobře)**

In Pardubice on August, 18, 2017

Mgr. Irena Reimannová, Ph.D.  
Second Reader