

THESIS REVIEWER'S OPINION						
Student's full name	Klára Žejdlíková					
Thesis title	Adjective Order in the Noun Phrase					
Reviewer's name	Jeffrey Keith Parrott					
Degree course	English for Business Administration					
Mode of study	Full-time					
Thesis evaluation criteria	Classification grade according to ECTS					
Structure						
Outline and division	A	B	C	D	E	F
Language level	A	B	C	D	E	F
Formatting (citations, presentation)	A	B	C	D	E	F
Content						
Thesis statement formulation	A	B	C	D	E	F
Sources and their utilization	A	B	C	D	E	F
Methods of processing the research problem	A	B	C	D	E	F
Level of analytical and interpretive components	A	B	C	D	E	F
Formulation of conclusions and meeting the objectives	A	B	C	D	E	F
Originality and vocational contribution	A	B	C	D	E	F
Evaluation justification (strengths and weaknesses of thesis):						
<p>This thesis is about adjectives in English, focusing on the linear order of pre-modifying adjectives in the noun phrase. While it is true that the question of adjective order has been seriously considered in the linguistic literature, the thesis does not clarify or contribute to this discussion.</p> <p>The structure of the thesis is unusual in that four of its five numbered chapters are in the first part, "Theory", with the second part, "Analysis", consisting only of Chapter 5 "Methodology" and an unnumbered Conclusion (Chapter 4 is also titled "Conclusion"). The second chapter, "Noun phrase", has only one subsection 2.1, which has subsections down to level 2.1.2.2. More pages are devoted to a sketchy general description of adjectives and noun phrases (Chapters 1-2 = 12 pages) than to describing the ordering of adjectives (Chapter 3 = 4 pages) or the study itself (Chapter 5 = 6 pages). The hypotheses are only stated at the end of Chapter 4 and again at the beginning of Chapter 5.</p> <p>The academic style is generally acceptable, although both hedging and 1st person are overused; the English level is just adequate for the BA level, with many unnatural formulations and orthographic issues, including spelling and punctuation errors. The formatting is acceptable overall, with only minor issues; however, the formatting in Chapter 5 is significantly worse, with Table 4 being an especially egregious example.</p> <p>The research question is not clearly formulated at the outset or the conclusion, although largely unmotivated hypotheses about adjective ordering are finally presented more than halfway through the thesis. The "theoretical" sections display significant misunderstandings, with major analytical errors concerning determiners and post-modifiers, among other things (see Table 1 for a characteristic example). The two figures given in the thesis, which superficially resemble trees, are inaccurately rendered. The sections that summarize the results of the grammaticality survey are nearly incomprehensible.</p>						

Questions to be answered by student:

1. The hypotheses depend on a classification of adjectives as “subjective vs objective”. How was this classification determined for each particular adjective, and especially for those included in the grammaticality survey? Is there any independent, i.e. objective, way to decide about the relative subjectivity of adjectives?

2. On page p14 it is stated that “There are also adjectives which are non-gradable, which means that they cannot be regularly graded by adding suffixes. Adjectives which are non-gradable, [sic] cannot be graded by adding suffixes, so they are preceded by the words *more* and *most*”, for example “*more/most interesting*”. This non-explanatory, twice repeated circular definition is evidently insufficient, so please describe the difference between adjectives like *small ~ smaller* and *interesting ~ more interesting* such that the former can take the grading suffixes, while the former require the support of a free morpheme.

Overall mark*

A	B	C	D	E	F
---	---	---	---	---	---

Date: 26/5/24

Signature: Jeffrey Keith Parrott

* Overall mark is not a mathematical average of individual marks.