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

Thesis Author: Jan Vysloužil

Title: LEXICOGRAPHIC PRINCIPLES IN CONTEMPORARY MONOLINGUAL

ENGLISH DICTIONARIES

Length: 61

Text Length: 42

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	see final comments down the page
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 final comments down the page
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 final comments down the page
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Outstanding ◄ Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see final comments down the page
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 final comments down the page

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 final comments down the page
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 final comments down the page
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 final comments down the page

Final Comments & Questions

The undergraduate thesis which has been assessed deals with a topical issue recruited from the area of lexicography – comparison of four of the chief electronic monolingual English dictionaries from the point of view of lexicographic principles.

After providing the reader with the basic information about the lay-out of the work in the chapter Introduction, the author of the thesis presents detailed theoretical information about the science of lexicography, further followed by the explanation and description of relevant terms of this science (e.g. the definition of "word", typology of dictionaries….). This provides a sufficient theoretical base for the actual analysis and comparison of four electronic dictionaries. A number of individual criteria are being considered and the results are organized into tables which make it possible to get an idea of the qualities of individual dictionaries.

In the following chapter Conclusions, the author gets to the conclusion supported by the relevant results of the analysis, and points out the dictionary which proved "to be closest to the ideal dictionary for the defined user (…)".

Throughout the whole thesis the author proves his ability to work with technical data, analyze them in an objective, unbiased way and to come to relevant, objective conclusions.

From the formal point of view, the work is of a very high quality. As a whole, it can definitely be considered as an excellent piece of academic writing. (suggested evaluation: "výborně")

Supervisor/**Reviewer**: PhDr. Jarmila Petrlíková, Ph.D.

Date: April 24 2014

Signature: