



REVIEW of BA diploma thesis

Author of the work: Lucie Kotyzová

Name of work: Questioning the Gender Identity: The Awareness of Non-binary Language Amongst the Young Czech Generation

Supervisor: Mgr. Michaela Čakányová, Ph.D.

Opponent: Mgr. Andrea Ramešová

Author of this review: Mgr. Andrea Ramešová

=====

Points /results (for each section & proposed classification)

<i>excellent</i>	5	A
<i>very good</i>	4	B
<i>good</i>	3	C

<i>acceptable</i>	2	D
<i>weak/sufficient</i>	1	E
<i>insufficient</i>	0	F

In the following paragraphs fill in the numeric value. You can also add a short NOTE (comment) - alternatively you write concluding remarks to the summary in the end.

	Points
<i>1. Originality and new contribution to the field, up-to-date presentation of the problem.</i> The topic is clearly original and relevant.	A
<i>2. Awareness of treatments in the field (literature).</i> The author provides an overview of gender-neutral English, significantly less attention is paid to gender-neutral Czech, which is, however, probably due to the fact that there have not been many studies about gender-neutral Czech yet. It is not clear why the author did not work with the original sources (Teresa de Lauretis [1991] and Judith Butler [1990] both in Watson [2005]), especially considering the fact that both are easily accessible online. Similarly, there is a quote by Beauviou (sic?), referred to in Wayne (2005, 86).	B
<i>3. Clarity of the topic, research question(s), hypotheses</i> The topic is clearly defined, the aim of the thesis is to <i>raise awareness about gender-neutral language and spread the possible ways to express non-binary identity</i> ; the author formulates her hypotheses as “predictions for the questionnaire” and then broadly compares these predictions with the questionnaire answers in the discussion section.	C
<i>4. Methodology.</i> At first, it is not clear from the text whether the <i>78 respondents</i> (p. 25) is the total number of participants, or the <i>93.3 %</i> of participants in the age group of 15–25 years old. The number of respondents is explained in section 3.3, which makes reading section 3.2 extremely difficult. It is not explained why there were 31 participants in each group as the proposed plan was thirty (possibly because the author had hoped for at least 30 but there were more participants in the end?)	D

<p>There is no need to list the number of participants as percentage (e.g., <i>51.3 % of the respondents . . .</i>), it is, in fact, rather confusing (especially, considering the fact that, for example, in case of counting participants of all age groups (p. 25), the total is 99.7 %; where did the author lose the 0.3 % of the participants?)</p> <p>In question three of the questionnaire, the author merges the participants who answered “yes” (i.e., identify as a non-binary person) and those who answered “other”. The author, however, does not explain why – is it because the participants explained their attitude explicitly in the comment? What if they just simply did not want to answer?</p> <p>Six responses were “unusable”, why is it? Because of the age of the participants, was the questionnaire incomplete, (or any other reason)?</p>	
<p><i>5. Argumentation, discussion, interpretation of the results, summary.</i></p> <p>The theoretical part of the thesis is slightly longer than the practical part; also, there are not enough data in the practical part to simply generalize or draw conclusions. Having said that, the author presents us with a useful list of possibilities that might be used in case gender-neutral language is necessary.</p> <p>The possible translation strategies are mostly listed rather than discussed and/or explained, though. Also, the author does not mention whether some strategies were popular with the same participants in both texts, i.e., if a participant decided to translate the pronouns literally in Text 1, did they apply the same strategy in Text 2?</p>	C
<p><i>6. Formal aspects of the work: format, graphics, bibliography formatting.</i></p> <p>The fact that the author did not indent first lines of paragraphs rendered orientation in the text rather difficult at times. Referencing is slightly inconsistent.</p> <p>I consider the author’s work with sources very poor.</p> <p>→ Is Valdřová (2010) and (Valdřová, Knotková-Čapková, Paclíková 2010, 10) [p. 8, p. 18] the same source or not? They are not listed as two sources in the “Works cited”.</p> <p>→ Which is correct: Milani (2016) [p. 10 and 11] or Milani, Tommaso M. 2017. ‘Language and Sexuality’. [“Works cited”]</p> <p>The following references are not listed in the “Works cited” section:</p> <p>→ Sullivan (2015); Morland (2015) [p. 11] (Are these the Downing, Lisa, Iain Morland, and Nikki Sullivan. 2015.? Why are they referred to separately?)</p> <p>→ Spivak (2010) [p. 13]</p> <p>→ Butler (2013) [p. 16]</p> <p>→ “Wilson’s work from 1553” (p. 16)</p> <p>→ “Murray presented their work” (1795?) (p. 16)</p> <p>→ In the sentence “They (Mackay [1980]) and other two linguists (Langendoen 1970, Valian 1977) found out (. . .)” (p. 17), two sources are mentioned, not listed in the “Works cited”, therefore it is not clear what the reference is to.</p> <p>→ Wayne (2004) [p. 19] – a typo?</p> <p>→ Michael Spivak in 1986 in eir book <i>The Joy of Tex</i> (p. 20)</p> <p>→ Hocko (2016) (p. 20)</p> <p>Listen in “Works cited” but not referred to in the thesis:</p> <p>→ Downing, Lisa, Iain Morland, and Nikki Sullivan. 2015.</p> <p>→ Evans, Gareth. 1980.</p> <p>→ Levý, Jiří, Patrick Corness and Zuzana Jettmarova. 2011.</p> <p>→ Nosko, I. N. 2016.</p>	E

