

## **Bachelor's thesis review**

*Thesis title: Role of individual differences in second language acquisition*

*Author: Daria Kyrylets*

*Supervisor: PhDr. Gabriela Seidlová Málková, Ph.D.*

---

This thesis promises to explore the role of individual differences in second language acquisition. The theses contains 36 pages of the content text and approx. 4 pages of the list of references.

The length of the text looks promising, however the structure and the actual content of chapters included are rather confusing, lacking inherent interconnection, clear thoughts and structure. It is not clear what is the aim of the theses and what are the research questions and why. The general structure of the text shows the students does not understand what the formal aspects of the "theoretical" (literature review) theses are and how this kind of theses should be constructed.

The Introduction chapter mentions what the students wants to show in the theses ("...that the temperament is a crucially important component of a second language acquisition..." p. 1). Chapter 2. Research question and aims mentions three research questions. However these questions are not formulated in any relation to the relevant literature. It is not clear then, why these three questions are so important to pose/ to ask; what their relevance is in the current literature or in the chosen research area.

Methodology chapter is not about methodology, it promises the theses to be a literature review, describes the content of the theses and at its end, it again discusses the purpose of the theses.

As the theses does not include any explanatory parts to explain the importance and relevance of proposed questions, and as the theses does not cover and parts to explain the interconnections of all chapters included, it results in episodic and incoherent piece of work. Literature review should not only pile a pieces of results or passages from other author's work or research, it has to show clear analytical work, the interconnected structure created by the author of the review. Presented theses does not have any analytical work, any clear and explained structure and lack coherence.

The Conclusion chapter only reviews what is (and was planned to be) included in presented theses and does not provide any analytical work, any true answers to the proposed research questions. Conclusions are weak and vague, for example: "...all temperaments are individual..." (point 1), "...temperament plays a key role in the second language acquisition.....(point 2), "... all students are

different..... “ (point 5), etc. No theories, no authors, no cited concepts mentioned to provide any interpretations, analytical or even descriptive work to summarize presented contents of the ch. 3. – 8. What more, there are no clear answers to any of the proposed research questions presented in Ch. 1.1.

Finally it is important to note, that the language quality of the theses is rather low, many sentences do not make any sense (for example “...The same language is used for teaching children has a narrow vocabulary level ...”, p.20) and it is clear that the proofreading was not done properly. Referencing is also poorly done, the student is using many inconsistent variations of how refer to the original literature, some references are not properly done.

The degree of similarity of the theses in SIS is rather high- 77% (!).

I have to conclude, that the presented thesis is not acceptable for the defence procedure and that the theses should be thoroughly revised.

PhDr. Gabriela Seidlová Málková, Ph.D.

28. 8. 2017