

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

Thesis Author: **Michal Zeman**

Title: *An Analysis of Modern Authentic Texts from the Point of View of Lexical Morphology with the Focus on Newspapers and Advertisements*

Length: 59 pages

Text Length: 36 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	
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	
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	
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	
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	
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	
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	
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	

Final Comments & Questions

The author has produced an excellently researched, well written and thought-provoking thesis. Some comments and questions, both specific and more general, relating to the work are listed below.

Are the results based on data from newspaper texts and advertisements applicable to the language as a whole – bearing in mind that newspaper texts themselves are by no means homogenous? And the same might also be said of advertisements: one would expect considerable differences between a pithy, eye-catching advertisement on the pages of a popular magazine or billboard on the one hand; then, on the other, a product being offered via a professional publication where the emphasis would probably be more on technical parameters and performance than immediate visual impression and catchy slogan.

p. 3 The description of “possible words” vs. “actual words”, based on Plag (2002) is somewhat nebulous, just as it is not quite clear what is meant by “the mental lexicon of common people”: what are the qualifications for membership of this group?

p. 9 Again one has to take issue with Plag, this time as regards blocking. Contrary to what is claimed here, the word *decentness* does exist, being listed in several online dictionaries. The same is true of *stealer*, which also appears in certain compounds where *thief* would sound inappropriate, e.g. *base-stealer* (baseball) or *scene-stealer* (acting profession).

p. 14 Still on the subject of blocking, why would the verb *evolute* be necessary when *evolve* already exists?

p. 17 It is stated that the male name *Ron* is derived from *Aaron*; however, it could equally well be derived from *Ronald* – and in Britain, at least, this is more likely to be the case. A similar instance would be *Andrew*, which may be abbreviated to either *Andy* or *Drew*, though one’s personal observations suggest the latter form, while relatively common in the USA, is seldom used in the UK.

p. 25 In Text 01, why is *panhandler* excluded from the analysis?

Although the list of references does contain several up-to-date items, it is curious that “two of the most relevant sources for the analysis” (p. 1) are publications over 40 years old – which suggests they are no longer so “modern” or “present-day” as their titles imply. Is it really the case that nothing worthwhile on the topic has appeared in the intervening period?

Recommended grade: **výborně**

Reviewer: Andrew Tollet

Date: 12th May 2014

Signature:

