



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: Terminology of disability: A historical perspective

Reviewed as: a supervisor an opponent

Author of the thesis: Kateřina Půlkrabová

Title of the thesis: *Terminology of disability: A historical perspective*

Year of submission: 2023

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



Review, comments and notes (ca. 100-200 words)

Strong points of the thesis:

- The topic of the thesis is interesting from a linguistic point of view and highly relevant for our current social discourse.
- The area as defined by the thesis seems relatively under researched.
- The general idea of the methodology is sound and the research is ambitious in a positive sense.
- The corpus (COCA) and the sources for the list of terms are chosen well. The manual data analysis was probably demanding.

Weak points of the thesis:

To rigorously test her hypothesis, the author needs to improve a number of methodological points:

- the choice of the final 26 words is a bit unclear, it should be better thought through in view of the hypothesis (see questions below) and explained in more detail (the choice of query items is crucial for any corpus research!)
- the choice of the three particular journals is not explained
- the queries used to extract individual occurrences of the selected words are not listed or explained – it is unclear e.g. if lemmatization was used (the author lists *intellectual disabilities* but not the singular form, while she also lists both forms for other items), if word class played any role (*alcoholic* as noun seems promising, less so as an adjective) and why *autism spectrum disorder* was extracted when the list also includes *autism* (that presumably includes the results of the first query)
- the total number of extracted occurrences and of those excluded should be explicitly stated
- based on the appendix, it seems (after the reader her/himself adds all the numbers in Table 1 and Table 2) that the total number of occurrences remaining after the manual analysis is 10 883. Has the author really manually analysed probably well over that number (since some results were excluded) of results?
- the calculations used may not be appropriate, see the questions below.

The language level of the thesis is unbalanced. Some parts are formally much more polished than others. The latter parts suffer especially from problematic word order and often missing punctuation.

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

1. Why is normalization per subcorpora used only for some results?
2. What is the reason for using average frequencies?
3. How were the averages calculated?
4. Why is the use of average frequencies problematic in view of the main hypothesis?
5. What would be a better way to test the main hypothesis?
6. Why is the choice of some (only a fraction of the total) derogatory terms problematic in view of the main hypothesis? And as a hint, in terms of the main hypothesis, what is the difference between the number of articles and frequencies of terms mentioned e.g. on p. 50?
7. How could the problems in q. 6 be solved?

Other comments:



FACULTY OF ARTS
Charles University

Department of English and ELT Methodology

Proposed grade:

excellent very good good fail

Place, date and signature of the reviewer:

Mgr. Ondřej Tichý, Ph.D.

Prague, 28.8.2023