

Review of Bachelor's Thesis

Opponent: I. Hvorecka Ph.D.

Bachelor Thesis Title:

The Role of Extroversion and Introversion in Second Language Classroom Behavior among Young Adult Learners

“The Role of Extroversion and Introversion in Second Language Classroom Behavior among Young Adult Learners” is Ms Rozinko's second version of her bachelor work. It should be noted that the thesis explicitness, text organization and clarity have been improved, plagiarized parts of the paper have been removed. In what follows, I will just give some comments on the work without going back to the details and remarks that were provided in my review of the first version of Ms Rozinko's paper.

Ms Rozinko kept the formulation of her research aims and research question unchanged but significantly reorganized the part of the thesis called The Theoretical Part, which made it somehow more readable.

However, the lack of balance of the relevant information provided in separate subchapters is puzzling. The subchapter 2.1 Factors Affecting SLL (p. 5), although being necessary, says very little – it just gives an extremely sketchy and disorganized enumeration of some of the factors related to SLL (despite the claim in 2. Theoretical Part that “all possible variables influencing SLL will be listed”(p.5)). Even though Ms Rosinko meagerly admits the necessity “to consider all possible interfering variables”, some possibility that “the outcomes might be affected by other variables”, and the statement that the “aim of the study is to narrow down the interest to only one of the variables and test whether the variable could work independently” I could trace little if any attempts in the study to actually fulfill that aim – not a single factor enumerated (age, gender, proficiency, etc.) was controlled in the work.

Ms Rozinko devotes 4 pages of subchapter 2.4. Extroversion Trait and SLL to an overview of the works in SLL field concerning the relationship of personality traits and SLL success (which is being mistakenly treated by Ms Rozinko as a synonym of “proficiency”), comes to a conclusion that no straightforward relationship has been establish and then devotes the next page and a half (!) to the discussion of how personality traits might affect SLL behavior by just briefly mentioning that this effect might be somehow related to classroom management and students' choices of learning strategies. By the way, although Ms Rosinko states that “In his research Baumeister (1999) asserted that introverts and extroverts behave in different ways in the context of SL learning” (p.15) this is simply not true. Prof. Baumeister in his short introduction to the book “The self in social psychology” (Baumeister, 2001)¹ does not say a single word on anything that would be even remotely connected to the “context of SL learning”!

As the thesis research aims and questions are explicitly and directly related to personality traits and learner behavior in the classroom rather than learner's success I'd consider the theory overview of this issue to be insufficiently focused. The conclusion given at the end of the subchapter 3.1. Summary of Theoretical Part “...it can be summarized that second language learning behavior is likely to be affected by individual characteristics” (p.18) sounds a little bit trivial – isn't it the case that whatever we do is after-all always influenced by our personalities?

Subchapter 3.2. Research Question formulates the study question and attempts, however unsuccessfully, to explain differences between SL acquisition and SL learning (p.18). The student could have avoided this clumsy explanation (the clumsiness being caused, most probably, by her limited English or knowledge of the issue) by simply using one of the concepts consistently through out the paper.

1 Baumeister, R. F. (1999). The nature and structure of the self: An overview. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *The self in social psychology* (pp. 1–20). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Subchapters 3.3. Methodology, 3.4. Results, and 3.5. Discussion show more logic than in the first version of the paper and meet the general requirements set for an empirical study. However, to decipher the English of the subchapter 3.3.4. Procedure one needs skills of a detective.

As for the English language of the paper in general, I should admit it has not been improved much. The work's English needs serious editing and whoever taught Ms Rosinko English syntax and how to use existential constructions there is/there are should be sentenced to life reading of her thesis.

Part 4. Conclusion is more or less a summary of the parts Results and Discussion and does not add much to general understanding of the thesis. However, it seems that the student fulfilled the aims of her study by demonstrating that

... extraversion and introversion characteristics of second language learners' personalities affect their preferences in language learning activities and the way they behave in L2 classroom. (p.38)

I, therefore, may conclude that Ms Rosinko's thesis is defensible – it meets the requirements applied to bachelor papers. I would suggest mark 3 or 2 in case the defense of the thesis is excellent.

I. Hvorecka Ph.D.
Prague, 19th May, 2017