

Undergraduate Thesis Assessment Rubric
Department of English, Faculty of Education, University of West Bohemia

Thesis Author: **Tereza Karlovcová**

Title: *Negation in English – the means and semantics with special focus on the use of “a”, “any” and zero article*

Length: 66 pages

Text Length: 33 pages

Assessment Criteria	Scale	Comments
1. Introduction is well written, brief, interesting, and compelling. It motivates the work and provides a clear statement of the examined issue. It presents and overview of the thesis.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	See comments overleaf.
2. The thesis shows the author’s appropriate knowledge of the subject matter through the background/review of literature. The author presents information from a variety of quality electronic and print sources. Sources are relevant, balanced and include critical readings relating to the thesis or problem. Primary sources are included (if appropriate).	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	See comments overleaf.
3. The author carefully analyzed the information collected and drew appropriate and inventive conclusions supported by evidence. Ideas are richly supported with accurate details that develop the main point. The author’s voice is evident.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	See comments overleaf.
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	See comments overleaf.
5. Conclusion effectively restates the argument. It summarizes the main findings and follows logically from the analysis presented.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	See comments overleaf.
6. The text is organized in a logical manner. It flows naturally and is easy to follow. Transitions, summaries and conclusions exist as appropriate. The author uses standard spelling, grammar, and punctuation.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	See comments overleaf.
7. The language use is precise. The student makes proficient use of language in a way that is appropriate for the discipline and/or genre in which the student is writing.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	See comments overleaf.
8. The thesis meets the general requirements (formatting, chapters, length, division into sections, etc.). References are cited properly within the text and a complete reference list is provided.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	See comments overleaf.

Final Comments & Questions

One's general impression of this work is that either it was completed in undue haste or the author simply saw no need to incorporate what comes across as a series of preliminary notes and citations into a fluent academic text. The theoretical background is basically a series of staccato paragraphs, some consisting of a single sentence which barely stretches to two lines, each devoted to what one particular authority has pronounced on the topic under analysis.

Moving on to the author's own research, we are told on p. 15 that *Of course, there are a lot of negative sentence examples in the books reference, but if we want to deal with the current English language, it is necessary to present negative sentences from contemporary English literature.* Why? Is the implication that some of the sentences from academic sources are less representative or that, for whatever reason, literary texts are more valuable than non-fictional ones?

At first sight the analysis section might appear visually attractive with its coloured diagrams but the accompanying text is disappointingly short of any in-depth commentary. Perhaps there simply was not an awful lot of interest to comment on but merely repeating the statistics from the graphs and quoting specific examples from the data, all of which appear in the appendix anyway, is not the best way to maintain the reader's interest, let alone persuade them that the whole enterprise was worthwhile in the first place.

As implied above, the writing style leads to a rather disjointed impression which does not make for easy reading and there are times when inappropriate use of *we* and *our* gives the text too informal a tenor.

Overall, the work may be said to meet the minimum requirements to pass, but that is about all.

Recommended mark: **dobře**

Reviewer: Andrew Tollet

Date: 30th August 2019

Signature:

