

Thesis evaluation form - Master thesis evaluation

Student's Name: Bc. Anastasiia Yevdokimova

Study programme: EKS

Title of thesis: *Bilingualism as a conflicted form of life*

Name of reviewer (supervisor): Martin Švantner, PhD

A) Formal criteria. Rating (0-10 points): 7

Formal structure and layout of the thesis, completeness of the required parts of the thesis, grammatical and stylistic aspects, correct and consistent citation of sources.

Comments: The text is formally correct, the author quotes consistently and coherently, and the wide range of sources she has reviewed should be appreciated. Stylistically, the text is on a very good level, written in a manner of sophisticated academic English. There are a few typos and errors in the text, but within tolerable limits. With an overstatement, diploma thesis is written in a rather captivating style.

B) Structure of the thesis. Rating (0-10 points): 5

Clear formulation of the problem, definition of the aim and its consistency with the content of the thesis, overall conception and structure of the thesis, adequacy of the procedure and continuity of the individual parts of the thesis.

Proportionally, the text is unbalanced, and what I consider as a problem here is the absence of a more convincing conclusion. The conclusion is short given the breadth of topics discussed.

This is another problematic aspect of the present text, which lies in the very broad scope of the selected topic. The general aim, it seems to me, is somewhat beyond the capabilities of the DT. As the author has stated:

“The aim of this work is to explore the current situation of diglossia in Ukraine through the lens of a conflicted form of life that is characteristic of the current condition of Ukrainian society.” (p. 2)

The first problem is the determination of the "present" - the author often replaces precise methodological analysis with her (however sympathetic) engagement; the text would benefit from a deeper analysis of sociolinguistic approaches to the relationship between language and society, politics and history. However, as mentioned, this is simply too much for this type of texts.

Similar conceptual problems also accompany the chosen philosophical perspectives. The author treats the chosen concepts rather loosely, even superficially - as in Wittgenstein and Foucault case, from which the author quotes rather selectively. Moreover, it is problematic to link philosophical concepts originally intended to address non-sociolinguistic issues. This is not to say that such an approach is not possible. However, the text lacks a description of more convincing and fundamental connection between the presented philosophical concepts and discussed general linguistics issues.

This is evident, among other things, in the author's treatment of theoretical approaches to myth. The first introduction of the myth lacks a comparative conclusion. Barthes, for

example, would probably not share Cassirer's strongly moralising perspective, nor do I think it is possible to simply say that Barthes follows Cassirer, or that Cassirer is Barthes' predecessor.

Comments:

C) Analysis of the topic. Rating (0-10 points): 7

Identification and explanation of key terms and concepts, scope and relevance of literature used, level of engagement with the literature, adequacy of interpretation of texts used.

Comments: Despite the aforementioned criticisms, the exploration of the problem seems to be successful, the author manages to connect the concepts discussed with the main (albeit very broad) aim of the text.

D) Originality aspect. Rating (0-10 points): 8

The author's own analysis of the problem addressed, the ability to think independently and creatively and to propose solutions, his/her own level of argumentation and formulation.

E) Significance of the work. Evaluation (0-10 points): 7

Formulation of clear and justifiable conclusions, adequacy and completeness of meeting the objectives of the thesis, overall professional level and contribution of the thesis.

Questions: Do you see any conceptual similarities/differences between Barthes' mythology and the Wittgensteinian concept of life form?

Total points (0-50 points): 34

Overall rating (grade)*: Very good

Rating scale:

50-40 points: 1 - excellent

39- 25 points: 2 - very good

24- 15 points: 3 - good

14-0 points: 4 - poor

Date: 6. 9. 2021

Signature: