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

Thesis Author: **Zdeňka ĎURKOVSKÁ**
Title: **COPULAR PREDICATIONS IN ENGLISH AND IN CZECH**
Length: 59
Text Length: 34

Assessment Criteria	Scale
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

Comments & Questions

The introduction is well written; it is well-organised and clear and it fluently presents the main aims and structure of the thesis.
The very first part of theoretical chapter (2.2) is rather confusing, with the author jumping from one aspect of comparison to another, from Czech to English and back. The semantic evaluations randomly blend with grammatical comments, which results in a certain chaos in presentation. Sometimes a confirming example is missing (e.g. final idea in 2.2.2.), which makes an impression of incompleteness. Such unclear disorganisation time to time appears on various places further in the text, which sometimes makes the reading difficult.
I appreciate the choice of books to analyse, an effort to cover varied aspects is evident. The analysis chapter, which I consider the essence of the work, is much more successful. The author seems to feel more comfortable when presenting her own work than when compiling a collage of other people's attitudes. The research itself is well and clearly introduced. The results are not only illustrated in graphs, but also commented on verbally and accompanied by representative examples.
The language of the work is correct, the style (except for the beginning part) is good, the number of resources is sufficient. At the beginning of my reading, I was rather confused by the fact that the table of contents ends by the very last chapter of the text proper and does not include the following material (references, appendices, Summary in Czech…).
In summary, despite some stylistic weaknesses, the thesis is a decent piece of academic work and deserves the evaluation of 1 or 2, depending of the performance at the defence.

Reviewer: PhDr. Naděžda Stašková, Ph.D.
Date: September 1, 2017
Signature: