

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

Thesis Author: Nina Stojković

Title: SOME MISTAKES IN PORNUNCIATOIN PRODUCED BY A CZECH NATIVE SPEAKER

*opavská*  
*21.1.2015*

Length: 47

Text Length: 35

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

### Final Comments & Questions

This undergraduate thesis deals with a very practical issue – if focuses on the mistakes of Czech speakers in the pronunciation of English. Next to this, it aims at analyzing most frequent mistakes and getting information about sufficient theoretical knowledge of English pronunciation Czech students of English get from their teachers.

In the theoretical part the author provides a very detailed description of the pronunciation of all English phonemes with reference to the existence or non-existence of their Czech counterparts. The following chapter then provides the actual analysis of the oral performances of 11 Czech speakers of English. Unfortunately the author was not able to make full use of all the aspects of pronunciation mentioned in the theoretical description; and the analysis shows only the most obvious mistakes in the pronunciation with little or no attention to such aspects of pronunciation as aspiration, dark /l/.... Thus it proves to be rather superficial and simplistic. And this is, of course, the problem of the conclusions, which can only be described as simplistic (the part providing the results of individual analyses is missing completely). On the other hand, I appreciate the information about the background of learning pronunciation by the individual Czech speakers.

From the formal point of view, the work is at a good level, the language is at an acceptable level, from the point of view of the contents, as mentioned above, it is rather simplistic in some parts. Nevertheless, it can be considered as an acceptable piece of academic writing. (suggested evaluation: “dobře”)

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

Date: April 24 2014

Signature:

