



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:

Reviewed as:  a supervisor  an opponent

Author of the thesis: Ing. Martin Sotona

Title of the thesis: *Examining lexical complexity in the written production of L2 proficient learners of English*

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



### **Brief description of the thesis**

The aim of the study is to investigate whether professional texts in economics written by native and advanced non-native speakers at C2 level differ in selected parameters of lexical complexity. At the same time, it is an interesting attempt to check whether it is possible to use the commercially available TextInspector tool to detect the difference in levels. In a way, the research builds on the work of Rálišová (2020), who used this tool to compare differences in lexical complexity between two different levels of advanced English learners. The present thesis thus complements it by comparing highly advanced speakers with native speakers.

The author focuses on the dimensions of lexical variety and lexical sophistication. For his research he compiled a corpus of 20 student papers, which he compares with a comparable corpus of 20 economic texts written by native speakers.

In the theoretical section, he defines key concepts and provides a brief review of the literature on such comparisons. The methodology is clearly described. Results are evaluated through statistical tests and compared with similar studies. It is a pity that he has not supplemented the work with a qualitative analysis of selected passages from his corpus, which could have been used to illustrate, for example, the descriptors from the Common European Framework of Reference, which he describes on pages 17–18. The author consulted the work regularly, but the entire research design and data collection methodology is his own.

### **Review, comments and notes**

#### ***Strong points of the thesis:***

The work is clearly structured and written, the use of TextInspector and the analyses performed, including statistical tests, are appropriate to the nature of the data. The author has realized many shortcomings of the chosen tool during the analyses and describes them well in the final passages of the thesis.

#### ***Weak points of the thesis:***

- lower number of comparable studies;
- problems with comparability of the compared texts stemming from their different lengths;
- the order of the sections could have been more logical, e.g. the passage on the CAF model could have been preceded by a section on lexical complexity;
- some parts of the thesis are not relevant (e.g. section 3.2.1.4 describing the functions of TextInspector);
- the discussion is not always fully related to the research carried out; moreover, some passages belong more in the literature review section;
- the discussion is less elaborate; if the author had worked with more comparable studies, he could have reached a deeper synthesis;
- some of the tests in the analysis arise from the nature of the texts analysed rather than from the specifics of the students' language.

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

To what extent can TextInspector be used to analyse pupils' work? Do the data obtained in this way have any relevance for their evaluation in the school environment?



FACULTY OF ARTS  
Charles University

---

Department of English and ELT Methodology

***Other comments:***

I highly appreciate the author's commitment to the task at hand, his efforts to regularly consult and revise the text based on my comments, his punctiliousness and time-keeping despite the many obstacles which lay in his way whilst writing the thesis.

**Proposed grade:**

excellent  very good  good  fail

Place, date and signature of the reviewer:

Prague, 12 January 2022