



## POSUDEK OPONENTA BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

---

Studijní obor: **Anglický jazyk a literatura (dvouoborové studium)**

Název práce: **A case study: applying conversation analysis to the understanding of how to teach English to an 11-year-old Czech pupil suffering from ADHD**

Autorka práce: Simona Koubová

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: Mgr. Helena Lohrová, Ph.D.

Oponent bakalářské práce: Mgr. Petr Kos, Ph.D.

---

### Short characteristics of the thesis

The aim of the work is to present a case study demonstrating the issues connected to teaching children suffering from ADHD, analyse the teaching interaction using Conversation Analysis, and suggest teaching methods that would mitigate the effects of the disorder on the children's education. The author works with recordings of her own teaching efforts with an 11-year-old boy suffering from ADHD.

In her thesis the author first characterizes the disorder, describes the methodology of Conversational Analysis, introduces the teaching methods that may be instrumental in overcoming the problems connected to the disorder, and finally provides the analysis and results of her own research.

### Overall assessment

The work generally succeeds in fulfilling the goals set at the beginning and thus accomplishes its purpose. It may serve as inspiration to teachers facing similar problems.

There are, however, a few shortcomings I would like to comment on. The first one concerns the division of the work into chapters and sections. When reading the work, one notices the extremely long introduction which is attributable to the fact that the author already describes, among other things, the symptoms and impact of the disorder as well as the children subject to study. Such descriptions could have been devoted separate chapters, which would make the work clearer to follow.

More importantly, better structuring of the main part of the work, namely Chapter 4 Analysis, would help to achieve the work's aim more successfully. It would, perhaps, have been helpful if the analysis were divided into individual aspect/issues connected to ADHD (such as impulsiveness, motivation, self-disruption, building up trust) and the application of teaching methods (such as TPR and TBLT) meant to mitigate the individual symptoms with subsequent discussion whether the method applied was successful. The use of transcriptions from lessons would then, perhaps, be more illustrative. This way it leads to the impression that the analysis is a commentary on the course of the lessons rather than research aiming at solving certain issues. In other words, a better structure would help to highlight the main outcomes of the research.

For example, the purpose of the division of teaching and learning strategies into successful (p. 38) and unsuccessful (p. 42) is not very clear, as both parts describe the same teaching strategies – these are rather instances of successful and unsuccessful



application of the strategies. Also, from the excerpt at p. 44 (teaching abstract terms denoting school subjects) it is not clear how this corresponds with the TBLT method.

My final comment, or rather a question, concerns the choice of subject students for the study. Why does the author introduce two students when the actual analysis is applied on one of them only?

In spite of these shortcomings I believe the work has achieved its aim. Although I am not sure how much its conclusions may be applied generally, I see its main contribution to the professional growth of the author herself – she analysed her teaching activities with ADHD children in detail, drew conclusions from her experience, and this will definitely be beneficial in her future work.

Práci doporučuji k obhajobě.

Navrhovaná klasifikace: velmi dobře

19.8.2019

Datum

Podpis