

Undergraduate Thesis Assessment Rubric (Methodology, Linguistics)
Department of English, Faculty of Education, University of West Bohemia

Thesis Author: Jakub Řehula

Title: FRENCH LOANWORDS IN SAMPLE TEXTS INTENDED FOR ADVANCED ENGLISH LEARNERS

Length: 47

Text Length: 32

<i>Assessment Criteria</i>	<i>Scale</i>	<i>Comments</i>
1. Introduction is well written, brief, interesting, and compelling. It motivates the work and provides a clear statement of the examined issue. It presents and overview of the thesis.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable <u>Somewhat deficient</u> Very deficient	see below
2. The thesis shows the author's appropriate knowledge of the subject matter through the background/review of literature. The author presents information from a variety of quality electronic and print sources. Sources are relevant, balanced and include critical readings relating to the thesis or problem. Primary sources are included (if appropriate).	Outstanding <u>Very good</u> Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see below
3. The author carefully analyzed the information collected and drew appropriate and inventive conclusions supported by evidence. Ideas are richly supported with accurate details that develop the main point. The author's voice is evident.	Outstanding Very good <u>Acceptable</u> Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see below
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Outstanding Very good <u>Acceptable</u> Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see below
5. Conclusion effectively restates the argument. It summarizes the main findings and follows logically from the analysis presented.	Outstanding Very good <u>Acceptable</u> Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see below
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 uses standard spelling, grammar, and punctuation.	Outstanding Very good <u>Acceptable</u> Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see below
7. The language use is precise. The student makes proficient use of language in a way that is appropriate for the discipline and/or genre in which the student is writing.	Outstanding Very good <u>Acceptable</u> Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see below
8. 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 <u>Acceptable</u> Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see below

Final Comments & Questions

I understand what motivated the author in his choice of this topic. As a learner of Roman languages and English, he felt the occurrence of words of Roman origin in English a sort of facilitating instrument in the study. As he used for his analysis texts in the student's book of Advanced English 4th edition by Cambridge University Press, with its more advanced lexicon, he wanted to demonstrate the presence of such vocabulary in the given topics (which he rather unfortunately and vaguely calls "some areas of language", while a more suitable term would be at least "some areas of language use"). From the point of stylistics, the occurrence of vocabulary borrowed from French / Latin (or Greek) in learned texts is one of regular stylistically distinctive features. I presume that the author wanted to show that not only learned texts but also other texts of different stylistic values (e.g. work, communication) can contain a certain portion of such words and expressions as well, and may provide a learner with the same tool. As a result of this decision he compared several extracts from different lexical fields and measured the percentage of occurrence of this (French) vocabulary.

However, one of the problems is that everything mentioned above is given, to a certain extent, through a rather clumsy formulation of the research aims. Although the author tries to explain his intention as well as possible, a clear introduction of the aim of the research, presentation of what he expects as a result and what exactly he wants to confirm is more or less missing. I can imagine that a reader can feel a little unsure what the main focus is.

In the theoretical chapter, the author deals with classifications of languages, introducing genealogical classification first. There is no mention of typological classification but another kind of classification, which is not very clear to me is submitted: "Secondly, the etymology classification is established by describing the types of origin and development of the lexicon." What I see as correctly incorporated in this chapter is the description of historical background in development of English and French including historical events in which both countries were involved, which logically led (among other things) to penetration of French vocabulary into English. I appreciate that the author brings the political, cultural and social reasons for the use of borrowed vocabulary in certain settings, social classes and areas of speakers' activities. Apart from this historical context of mutual influence of the two languages, I would appreciate a sub-chapter dealing with the linguistic process of acquiring foreign words in general, which would probably make a tighter connection to the research.

The presentation of the research aims and questions in the chapter called Hypothesis is unfortunately still not very clear. The author refers to a hypothesis which, however, has not been mentioned before: "The aim is to identify those areas that are in accordance with the hypothesis and those that are not, by analysing chosen samples." Then he introduces four fields where he expects great portion of French loanwords and adds that there are two more fields that have been also the subject of analysis in order to show the contrast because they "are not typically associated with French historical influence." But what kind of fields these are remains unsaid.

In the opening paragraphs of the chapter Results and Commentary the author describes certain obstacles that he had to overcome during the analysis. Some of these descriptions appear to me a little unclear, I think that illustrative examples would help (e.g. the question of compound words). In this chapter the author compares his initial expectations and the results, and adds his commentary on possible reasons. As for the graphs, I do not quite understand the double circular graph – the distribution of blue fields.

The Conclusion chapter summarizes the results. I think that the clear re-statement of the research question(s) should have opened this chapter with a more transparent answer if the research confirmed or disproved the hypothesis.

The language of the work is in some places not entirely precise but still acceptable.

Even if the work has its weaknesses, it shows the author's enthusiasm for languages, and despite certain clumsiness in some formulations he conveys his idea of facilitating the study through words known from previous study of French and submits particular examples of semantic fields where this advantage can be utilized.

The suggested evaluation: 3 ("good").

Suggestions for the discussion:

- 1) Methodology chapter: Explain more particularly what you meant by: "The tools mentioned earlier are used to recognize the potential group from which each word comes".
- 2) Results and Commentary: Explain the double circular graph.

Supervisor: PhDr. Naděžda Stašková, PhD.

Date 26th August 2023

Signature: