

THESIS REVIEWER'S OPINION						
Student's full name	Ludmila Lisoňková					
Thesis title	The Suffix "-ly" with the Adverbial As					
Reviewer's name	Jeffrey Keith Parrott, Ph.D.					
Degree course	English for Business Administration					
Mode of study	Full-time					
Thesis evaluation criteria	Classification grade according to ECTS					
Structure						
Outline and division	A	B	C	D	E	F
Language level	A	B	C	D	E	F
Formatting (citations, presentation)	A	B	C	D	E	F
Content						
Thesis statement formulation	A	B	C	D	E	F
Sources and their utilization	A	B	C	D	E	F
Methods of processing the research problem	A	B	C	D	E	F
Level of analytical and interpretive components	A	B	C	D	E	F
Formulation of conclusions and meeting the objectives	A	B	C	D	E	F
Originality and vocational contribution	A	B	C	D	E	F
Evaluation justification (strengths and weaknesses of thesis):						
<p>This BA thesis deals with Adjectives (Adj) and Adverbs (Adv) in English, which is doubtlessly a vast and complex topic. It is, for the most part, well organized, well written, and well formatted, although there are some minor errors and disfluencies. For example, the second definite article in the title ("the Adverbial As") should have been omitted, and the division into Parts I & II was unnecessary given that the chapters are simply numbered 1-4 (excluding the Introduction and Conclusion, which are not numbered at all). There is a more significant issue with the citation and reference formatting, namely that one source is given as "Dušková et al. 2003" in the reference section, excluding multiple co-authors, while conversely another source is cited as "Quirk 1985" in the text, excluding "et al." although there are three other co-authors listed in the reference. Nonetheless, the overall quality of author's writing and formatting is above average for this level, thus my final evaluation of the thesis as a high C, or as expressed below, a low B.</p> <p>Despite this strength, the biggest weakness of the thesis (and of course, a common problem for BA theses generally) is that it lacks any real research question, and consequently the corpus searches reported in the latter section test no hypotheses whatsoever. No arguments are found in the abstract, and although the introduction—and the title—promises an argument to the effect that the <i>-ly</i> of adjectives such as <i>friendly</i> is an inflectional suffix, this amounts to fewer than two pages (pp 30-31) closely reproducing the claims of others and does not connect with the corpus searches at all.</p> <p>Indeed, the entire first section (24/36 pages, i.e., two thirds of the thesis) reads like a virtual transcription of various references; there are few additional sources, but the main three are Quirk et al. (1985), Huddleston & Pullum (2002), and Veselovská (2017). The reliance of the thesis on these references is problematic, since the latter is an unpublished classroom "script" which itself largely relies on the former two sources; no matter how authoritatively they may be regarded, both Quirk and H&P are reference grammars, not primary linguistic literature. Numerous, mostly classificatory, claims made by these and other scholars are merely listed in the thesis without much, if any, argument or justification. Quotes are used inappropriately to explain things the author should explain; nearly every sentence in the first section contains a citation to the same handful of references.</p>						

Finally, there are non-sequiturs, circular arguments, and excessive hedges throughout the thesis. These and the other issues raised above are exemplified by the following passages:

(p 12) “The closed class category includes words used mainly for their grammatical function; thus, they are sometimes labelled as grammatical words or function words (Quirk 1985, 71–72).”

(p 23) “Adjectives functioning as object complements are used after a direct object (Biber et al. 1999, 515). They complete the meaning of the object.”

(p 33) “The use of zero-form adverbs is very typical for non-standard or colloquial English. The reason for this is due to the fact that they are said to be a typical feature of a particular dialect, therefore, they fall into the category of colloquial and informal speech (Tagliamonte 2002, 237–243). Tagliamonte indicates that the use of zero-form in present-day dialects “is an innovative form replacing the -ly form” (2002, 238).”

(p 41) “Overall, it can be said that the usage of careful as a zero-form adverb can be regarded as very rare and unconventional.”

Questions to be answered by student:

1. If ‘adverbial -ly’ is an inflectional suffix, what does it inflect for exactly (e.g., person, number, or gender)? Is there any other analysis that is compatible with the facts? Couldn’t the examples in (16-19) and (20-23) be explained by selection; that is, the comparative, superlative, and *-ness* affixes can attach only to +Adj stems?
2. In the subsections of Chapter 4, the following passage is repeated multiple times: “The verbs were selected because they were the results of the most frequent collocations occurring in COCA with the adverb [X]”. How was this determined and why were those searches not described in the thesis?
3. Why were no percentages given in Chapter 4?
4. Regarding *quick(ly)*, what about *fast*? While it’s true that *move* or *act* are infrequently collocated with *quick*, they seem perfectly fine with *fast* (I got more than 8 million results for “move fast” compared with just over 700 thousand for “move quick” on Google).
5. Since the search terms (e.g. *WALK slowly_r*) specify that the adverb must be adjacent to the verb, transitive verbs with direct objects are excluded from consideration. Is there a way to search for such strings (e.g., *read the book quickly/quick/fast*) and would it make any difference in the results?

Overall mark*

A	B	C	D	E	F
---	---	---	---	---	---

Date: 26/05/2022

Signature:

* Overall mark is not a mathematical average of individual marks.