

Undergraduate Thesis Assessment Rubric

Department of English, Faculty of Education, University of West Bohemia

Thesis Author: Jan Vejvoda
 Title: Evolution of the Zombie in a Post-colonial World: From *Day of the Triffids* and *28 Days Later* to *The Walking Dead*
 Length: 28
 Text Length: 25 (56,419 characters incl. spaces)

| 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 | Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| author uses standard spelling, grammar, and punctuation. | 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 idea behind this thesis is very interesting – to analyze representations of zombie apocalypse in popular culture with postcolonial theory. Unfortunately, it is poorly executed and I recommend that this thesis is not passed (4).

There are several reasons for this.

1. Often the connection to colonialism is made on the basis of poor analogies. For instance, a dictator figure is similar to a colonial overlord (or “viceroy,” as he has it, 20); or, shopping malls feature in zombie movies and colonialism was always about economic markets (18); or, race representations in the works is often biased or stereotyped (9); or, there is a connection colonialism because *The Day of the Triffids* and *28 Days Later* are set in Britain, which was a former imperial power. Following this logic, the same is true of every cultural work set in the UK. None of these issues are connected to postcolonial theory, which leads me to the next point.
2. The thesis does not mention a single work of postcolonial theory, and it is not apparent that the student knows much about colonialism. Postapocalyptic warlords are not similar to “colonial viceroys,” because, among other reasons, the latter are sent by a technologically advanced country to exploit the low labor costs and natural resources of another country.
3. The chapter on consumerism does not connect with postcolonialism, and, additionally, is poorly sourced.
4. More generally, the student does not work directly with academic research, but draws on popular journalism and encyclopedias.
5. The connections to Covid (e.g., 7) are not pertinent to the argument.
6. The list of “Main protagonists” resembles a Wikipedia entry and not part of an argument (10).

Reviewer: doc. Justin Quinn Ph.D.

Date: 10 August 2023

Signature: