

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

Thesis Author: **Michal Havlíček**
 Title: *English lexical items in Czech texts*
 Length: 60 pages
 Text Length: 40 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	<i>See comments overleaf</i>

Linguistic borrowings have been a feature of human communication for as long as there has been contact between two groups of people speaking different native languages. With specific regard to Czech and English, this process has developed apace over the past three decades plus that have elapsed since the Velvet Revolution. This bachelor thesis is a neatly presented and useful contribution to the literature in the way it traces the historical development of this process and provides numerous examples from contemporary Czech.

The theoretical sections of the work have been diligently researched as the author progresses logically from the general to the specific in explaining his terms of reference, although Chapter Five makes a slightly odd impression: the information provided is interesting in itself and possibly has some bearing on the topic but the fact the chapter consists of just one single page means it reads more like the introduction to a completely different paper. Prior to that, Chapter Four offers a series of lexical items in Czech, drawn from a variety of semantic fields, which have their origins in English. One curious inclusion on p. 21 is *mečbol*, obviously derived from 'match ball', but used in quite different contexts in the two languages: in English, it literally means the ball – usually a soccer ball – with which a game has been played and subsequently presented to a player for some outstanding achievement in the course of the match. In Czech, on the other hand, it is a tennis term, equivalent to what English-speaking commentators would call 'match point'. Later on in the work, commenting on the one of the results of his excellently presented questionnaire survey, the author states that familiarity with a word's origin is of lesser importance than *to understand its meaning and be able to use it correctly* (p. 35). This is logical; on the other hand, following Wittgenstein, "the meaning of a word is its use in the language", so transferred senses of lexical borrowings could be seen as an offshoot of the naturalisation process.

From a technical perspective the quality of the writing is for the most part very high, despite the occasional lapse into a less formal register with use of second- and third-person pronouns: *We have encountered* (p. 9), *We can talk here about* and *... you will usually use the wording* (both p. 19); *... we include* (twice on p. 21) are just a few examples; two others appear in a paragraph cited for different reasons below. Another minor quibble is that, for the benefit of the English reader, it would perhaps have been useful to add a brief explanation on p. 14 of *hodoválek*, *radovník*, *čtena* and *pravouk* – as, in fact, the author does do with the *kapesník– čístonosoplena* pairing on the following page.

By far the most confusing section of the work is 3.5 on pp. 16–17. The concept of pure language as defined in the Book of Zephaniah is certainly of some theological interest but perhaps of rather less relevance to the topic of the thesis. Nevertheless, possibly an argument could be made for its inclusion as a contrasting definition of "pure language", namely that deemed meet for communication in the Kingdom of God rather than an unsullied symbol of national identity; however, it would need to be presented differently, amongst other things without a block quotation marred by an intrusive authorial aside. Checking the source of the quotation is problematic since it has been omitted from the list of references; be that as it may, while one can appreciate the use of academic hedging, the author's concluding remark here seems inappropriate in terms of both style and content:

What to add? If we get rid of the elements of the fanatical Jehovah's faith, it might be nice to use language free from everything ugly, on the other hand, speech, which would be under the supervision of the Supreme Censor in all situations, would probably bring enormous boredom into our lives.

The most serious shortcomings, however, are in the formatting: italicisation of quotations is unnecessary; the same applies to subheadings. Block quotations do not require quotation marks; moreover, it seems unlikely the one on p. 19 could have occupied six or seven pages of text. Full stops should appear after parenthesised citations at the end of a sentence, not before them. Sometimes individual examples of vocabulary are italicised, other times they are not. To be fair, it should be noted that by no means is the author guilty of these transgressions all the time; however, they do appear in sufficient quantity to represent a distraction to the reader. Finally, the list of references is incomplete: in addition to the missing *Strážná věž* item referred to above, there are two instances whether the author has forgotten to add the place of publication – an omission only highlighted by the bold capitalised reminder to supply the missing information.

Recommended grade: **velmi dobře**

Supervisor: Andrew Tollet

Date: 26th August 2022

Signature: