

**Undergraduate Thesis Assessment Rubric (Methodology, Linguistics)**  
**Department of English, Faculty of Education, University of West Bohemia**

**Thesis Author:** Tereza Klencová  
**Title:** Analysis of the Language of Fairy Tales from the Point of View of Transferred Language.  
**Length:** 130  
**Text Length:** 55

<i>Assessment Criteria</i>	<i>Scale</i>	<i>Comments</i>
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 below
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 below
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 below
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see below
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 below
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 below
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 below
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 below

## Final Comments & Questions

In the brief and clear Introduction the author states the three main aims of the research and describes the structure of the work including the focus of each part. This chapter gives the necessary introductory information for the reader to get the basic overall picture of the thesis.

In the Theoretical Background the author starts from the most general description of the relevant study areas – Lexicology and Stylistics. A considerably large space is devoted to Semantics and to the explanation of its key concepts as the base for the author's research. While dealing with the concept of meaning, the author draws on various resources and presents several authors' approaches. Unfortunately, there are certain places in the chapter where some theoretical questions seem well-opened but a sort of unanswered, e.g. on p. 5, a distinction into "intrinsic" and "immanent" approach would deserve to be more particularly explained and possibly exemplified; similar problem may be seen on p. 7, where three components of meaning are mentioned but not commented on. Fortunately, this description is present, but it comes later, on p. 8 (still missing collocational meaning however). Various types of meaning change are briefly described, which I find sufficient, and a larger space is devoted to the most productive type – transfer, which is one of the key concepts regarding the topic of this work. I would only elide the definitions of the most frequent figures (metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche) in the introduction (being superfluous here, as they occur again in the survey of all figures later). In the presentation of individual figures, the choice of ordering seems a little unclear, I assume the proceeding from the best-known ones (?). The question is if the alphabetical order would be more reasonable (?) Or, at least the order might have been somehow justified.

When explaining the terms "literary criticism" and "literary theory", the author does not allow much space to her own voice, which actually results in large pieces of extracts from the literature. I understand that she only wanted to be precise and give precise citations, but from the point of view of style, her personal connecting language should have been more visible. This is not, fortunately, the case of the following subchapter, dealing with children's literature. The whole theoretical chapter is appropriately summarized and concluded, and the transition towards the following text is provided. In general, the author is well-organized regarding the transitions from one chapter to another placing a brief introduction paragraph at the beginning and a summarizing paragraph at the end of each part, which makes the reading easy to follow.

In the Method chapter, the author introduces the sources of fairy tales she examined and describes her steps when processing the material. I think that her intention to involve material coming from the four British regions is good as it seems to be fairy interesting to examine possible differences. On the other hand, the goal of the research was prevalingly linguistic, so I understand why the author concentrated on those texts that contained a required number of findings. The question remains if such a linguistic analysis is a suitable base for general comparison of the regions. I would not include this task as one of the main goals, and I would take these differences as a sort of secondary interesting result, which cannot (for the limitation reasons) be generalized. On the other hand, I like the choice of fairy-tales sources (they come from similar time periods), and the range of texts (they provided enough items to analyze), even if the numbers regarding the regions are not balanced.

In the Research chapter, the author presents the material found in the texts. I believe that it was not easy to decide about the method of presentation of items found, as there may be several ways. The found figures may be ordered alphabetically, or they may be given as a set of looked up figures followed by numbers of occurrence, or they may be introduced chronologically as they occur in the texts, or they may be ordered according to frequency, etc. From the work itself, it is not quite clear which method the author used; I can only suppose that it was chronological within each regional set of individual texts. In spite of this uncertainty, the author met the requirements of the number of items being examined in a linguistic thesis, the results have been found a presented, compared, summarized and commented on, including the illustrating graphs.

The Conclusion chapter comes back to the research questions established at the beginning of the research. The author introduces the main findings, presents the occurrence of individual figures and each of them exemplifies by several particular examples from the texts. She mentions the main presuppositions about the expected results and shows how the final results differ from them. In addition, she expresses her opinion on this different outcome in connection with the nature of the fairy-tale genre. Finally her comparison of the occurrence of figures in different regions is not uninteresting. From the material she had at her disposal, some differences must have been visible, e.g. the large number of figures on a much smaller space of Irish fairy-tales texts compared to a very low occurrence of figures in a larger volume of Welsh material. Apart from that, the author in conclusion evaluates the frequency of various figures regardless of the region and concludes her results with a commentary. Last, but not least, she realizes the limits of the research due to the limited extend of the given research as well as the limits of the given texts.

The spelling and grammar are correct (there is occasional punctuation ambiguity, and I would avoid contractions of the type *can't*), and so is the stylistic value of the text, which meets the stylistic requirements for a piece of academic work.

In summary, I think that the work sufficiently shows the author's involvement and careful attitude, and despite some reservations presented above, I recommend the evaluation "very good".

**Opponent:** PhDr. Naděžda Stašková, PhD.

**Date:** 9.6.2020

**Signature:**