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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Introduction is well written, brief, interesting, and compelling. It motivates the work and provides a clear statement of the problem. It places the problem in context. It presents and overview of the thesis. | Outstanding: Very good  
Acceptable: Somewhat deficient  
Very deficient: Very deficient |                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 2. Literature review is comprehensive and complete. It synthesizes a variety of sources and provides context for the research. It shows the author's understanding of the most relevant literature on the subject matter. | Outstanding: Very good  
Acceptable: Somewhat deficient  
Very deficient: Very deficient | The theoretical background section is rather shallow (not comprehensive). The author covers an extremely large range of topics without going into depth. In other words, there are too many ideas that aren’t developed. For example, the author only dedicates a page to the SAMR model that the later uses a key thing in his data analysis. The review doesn’t focus on the value and use of iPads in ELT explicitly. The contents on pp. 9-24 is of a very general nature without much relevance for the actual research carried out later. Overall, the chapter provides introduction into the issues of iPads in education for public, but it doesn’t provide a good and thorough theoretical framework for any research study. |
| 3. The methodology chapter provides clear and thorough description of the research methodology. It discusses why and what methods were chosen for research. The research methodology is appropriate for the identified research questions. | Outstanding: Very good  
Acceptable: Somewhat deficient  
Very deficient: Very deficient | The author mentions a number of contradictory statements which makes one question the origin of the research. For example, the author says that two school were selected for the research (p.25). Later, the author mentions three schools were a part of the research (p.26); however, he doesn’t provide any information about the third school. The author says that he was interested in determining whether iPads were used in teaching yet later on the very same page (p.25) he claims that he identified two schools that use iPads. |
| 4. The results/data are analyzed and interpreted effectively. The chapter ties the theory with the findings. It addresses the applications and implications of the research. It discusses strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of the research. | Outstanding: Very good  
Acceptable: Somewhat deficient  
Very deficient: Very deficient | The author draws conclusions about teacher's practices that, in my opinion, cannot be drawn based on the generally written questions in the survey. One would need to observe tasks with iPads or have a detailed description of these tasks to be able to say how the tasks correspond to the SAMR model and what digital literacies are developed. Even if a teacher claims that a creative app is used in a lesson, it cannot be assumed that the task is of a redefinition type (respondent #6). |
| 5. The thesis shows critical and analytical thinking about the area of study and the author's expertise in this area. | Outstanding: Very good  
Acceptable: Somewhat deficient  
Very deficient: Very deficient |                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 6. The text is organized in a logical manner. It flows naturally and is easy to follow. Transitions, summaries, and conclusions exist as appropriate. The author demonstrates high quality writing skills and uses standard spelling, grammar, and punctuation. | Outstanding: Very good  
Acceptable: Somewhat deficient  
Very deficient: Very deficient |                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 7. The thesis meets the general requirements (formatting, chapters, length, division into sections, etc.). References are cited properly within the text and a complete reference list is provided. | Outstanding: Very good  
Acceptable: Somewhat deficient  
Very deficient: Very deficient | The author fails to label graphics. There are unjustified parts of empty space on various pages (especially in the theoretical part of the thesis). The author doesn’t use APA properly in references (e.g. use of capital letters, italics). |

Final Comments & Questions

Mr. Štefančík shows a lot of enthusiasm about the topic of his thesis. There is no doubt that Mr. Štefančík has a lot of expert knowledge about iPads and how they could be used in education. At the same time, this expertise seems to be an obstacle in allowing Mr. Štefančík to go beyond his existing knowledge and examine credible academic sources to expand his expertise, develop a strong theoretical framework for his research, and consequently carry out an insightful research study. Subsequently, the thesis only discusses the topic of iPad use on the surface and in a very general way.

The second submitted version of the author’s thesis still bears lots of limitations as pointed out above. On the other hand, the author has made observable improvements to it in comparison with his first submitted version. I suggest that the thesis is awarded a passing grade.
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