



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: Vojtěch Kubánek

Title of the thesis: *Lexical Devices of British and American English in the Language of Czech EFL Learners.*

Year of submission: 2021

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:

- *Comprehensive and detailed theoretical section, clear explanation of terms.*
- *Excellent referencing style. Quotes well embedded.*
- *Displays good critical thinking; good synthesis of ideas, especially in the Theoretical Background section.*
- *Strong, clear hypothesis.*
- *Really good awareness of problems with data, section 3.2*
- *Results section clearly delineated. Some results able to draw very strong conclusions.*
- *Conclusion provides a good indication as to where future research is required, and its application to teaching. The conclusion is also insightful in that certain results may have limitations, and could highlight potential inaccuracies e.g., pertaining to the concept of Euro-English.*
- *Overall, the research produced some interesting main findings.*

Weak points of the thesis:

- *Only 1 group met the criteria to evaluate the impact of AmE teachers' dialectal preference on lexical dialectal preference of students. A comparison would have really added weight to the study.*
- *Resume and Appendix 2 only supplied in Czech – appendix 4 translates appendix 1 but the reader is not directed to this.*
- *Lots of informal language used throughout, and repetitive use of certain low-frequency lexical items (e.g., scrutinize/showcase/bestowed. Switching between terms e.g., student/subject/respondent*
- *Not always easy to follow notes e.g., section 3.1 'see 5'/ 3.2 *(see students' answer 13/19)*
- *Grammatical issues throughout, although not often impeding comprehension.*
- *The introduction has an overly bold claim regarding how the results of this thesis can be used in the future.*

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

You mention in the introduction that '*lexical dialectal variation between [BrE] and [AmE]...plays an important role in non-native's use of English*'. Could you explain the role it plays? Do you think it matters which variation(s) a student uses?

You state in 2.2 that '*a speaker of British English will be associated with a high social class*' and mention that it would '*presumably [be in] London*'. What evidence do you have to support this claim?



FACULTY OF ARTS
Charles University

Department of English and ELT Methodology

Section 3.2 describes how lexemes given by students which differed from the expected pair were considered invalid. Was this a finding that you had not predicted? As the translation aspect seemed to create problems, did you consider basing your method on Spångberg's 2017 study, where students had to choose between lexemes?

In section 4, as a footnote, you write that one student chose not to disclose 'his' gender, yet in 4.2.2 you use the pronoun 'their'. In 4.2.2. you also start to use the terms 'men' and 'women' to describe the students, whereas previously you have used 'male' and 'female'. Why do you think I am mentioning this?

Based on your research, would you like to see any changes to EFL coursebooks/resources/teaching?

Proposed grade:

excellent very good good fail

Place, date and signature of the reviewer:

Prague, 01.09.2021

Suzanne Lewis, MA