



## REVIEW of BA diploma thesis

Author of the work:

Title of the work:

Supervisor: Mgr. Markéta Janebová, Ph.D.

Opponent: Mgr. Markéta Dančová

Author of this review: Mgr. Markéta Janebová, Ph.D.

=====

### 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

	Points
1. <i>Originality and new contribution to the field, up-to-date presentation of the problem.</i> This is a contrastive study of apology in English and Slovak. The author did a pilot empirical study involving a Discourse Completion Task in both languages.	A
2. <i>Awareness of treatments in the field (literature).</i> The amount of literature is more than sufficient and the “awareness” is very good, but the way in which the sources are reviewed could be more coherent at times (for example, on p. 8, the shift from Leech to Brown and Levinson is rather abrupt). Sometimes the review is rather repetitive (for example, formulaic expressions in English reappear).	C
3. <i>Clarity of the topic, research question(s), hypotheses</i> Clear topic, clear research questions.	A
4. <i>Methodology.</i> Discourse Completion Task was chosen; classification follows Suszczyńska (1999).	A
5. <i>Argumentation, discussion, interpretation of the results, summary.</i> The data set is very interesting and it is a pleasure to read the examples. For each situation, the author presents a typical structure of the apology.  Research questions 1 and 2 are nicely addressed; research question 3 is quite difficult to follow. Wouldn't you need a light offence involving to address the issue?  A note concerning the role of intensifiers: Fewer intensifiers were found in Slovak. The author argues that the “smaller number of adverbs in Slovak responses may result due to stronger performative verbs in Slavic languages (Suszczyńska 1999)” (p. 42) This, however, does not seem to be related to the fact that they are stronger, but the fact that they are more common, and not modifiable by adverbs, unlike the expressions of regret (in Czech, <i>velmi líto</i> vs. <i>*velmi mi promiňte</i> )	A-B
6. <i>Formal aspects of the work: format, graphics, bibliography formatting.</i> There is definitely room for improvement here. The thesis as well as references could be more reader friendly. References are not consistent typographically.	C-D
7. <i>English (language correctness, style)</i>	E

<p>This is the weakest point of the thesis. There are many stylistically awkward or ungrammatical passages as well as places in which Slovak “shines through” the English text.</p> <p>For example:</p> <p>p.6 Since the offence had happened before the moment of speaking, it is a post-event speech act differentiating itself from other illocutionary acts</p> <p>p.6: apology serves as a medium to persuade H in changing his attitude</p> <p>p.6 there are only few studies</p> <p>p. 6 respondents will be asked to respond 6 different situations</p> <p>p.8. and the last one, which considered as the most influential is the Politeness theory, or as Fraser used “face-saving view” by Brown and Levinson from 1987.</p> <p>The questionnaire presented in the thesis still contains passages which I highlighted for the author as grammatically wrong.</p>	
<p>8. <i>For the supervisor (if not applicable, write " Not applicable ")</i></p> <p>Very good cooperation. Deadlines were met. The author was able to work independently.</p>	A

**Summary:** There is a lot of potential in the work. The examples are a pleasure to read. Unfortunately, and I’m really sorry about that, the language issues as well as some formal problems do not allow me to award the highest grade.

#### Questions for the defence:

1. From your experience with the DCT, what are the (dis)advantages of this method?
2. Situation 1 (bumping into an elderly lady): Your data do not corroborate Holmes (1990), who classifies this as a light offence. Which factor, in your opinion, should be included/revised/etc. so that her classification is more accurate?
3. Phrases such as *Predsa aj majster tesár sa niekedy utne* (e.g. Slovak situation 2): did they have English equivalents (i.e. did something like that appear in the English data set?) How were they classified in the thesis and why? (I was wondering if the classification according to Suszczyńska (1999) actually accounts for that.
4. Wouldn’t you need a light offence involving to address the issue in research question 3?

**I recommend the work for the defence: YES**

**Proposed classification:<sup>1</sup> C**

Date: 5.6.2022

Name (and signature): Mgr. Markéta Janebová, Ph.D.

<sup>1</sup> The itemized number evaluations above do **NOT** provide automatically the final evaluation - some weaknesses are more crucial than others and some cannot be compensated at all. The proposed classification is therefore independent on these statistics. It is the comprehensive evaluation of the presented written work and it can be still modified during the defence to become the result of the defence.