

Undergraduate Thesis Assessment Rubric
Department of English, Faculty of Education, University of West Bohemia

Thesis Author: **Eva Kabelíková**
 Title: *Interracial relationships in Hollywood movies*
 Length: 35 pages
 Text Length: 30 pages

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 author uses standard spelling, grammar, and punctuation.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient 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	

Overall, this work makes a curiously patchy impression. There are some early warning signs in the Abstract where the author states in the opening paragraph that she will be analysing four movies; however, the second paragraph begins with *All three movies also show* In fact, four movies are dealt with but, again, in the Introduction only three are mentioned and the reader can only speculate as to why *Loving* was not deemed worthy of inclusion in this section. Nor is it clear what to make of the claim *The movies are shot in different time periods and were made in different years* (p. 2) when two of them (to be pedantic, 50% of the total) were actually made in the same year, namely 2016.

As regards the content, there are times when the author seems to fall into a similar trap associated with a literature-based thesis, to wit substituting plot summary for proper analysis. To be fair, the author does make a number of salient points in the section entitled "Comparison", starting on p. 26 and it is a pity more space was not devoted to this. As it stands, the reader is unsure what to make of this statement in the Conclusion: *The more contemporary movies showed the couples and the reality of their time period, while the older movies were more customized to the audience to whom they were presented* (p. 30). The implication seems to be that modern movies provide a better guide to historical reality, which on the face of it seems a sweeping generalisation, though the author of this review is in no position to judge the veracity of such a claim. Either way, it would be equally interesting to learn more about the typical target-group audiences at whom the older movies were allegedly aimed.

The quality of language in this work is, on the whole, very good but there are certain shortcomings with the references. The list in itself is impressive in terms of its length, which far exceeds what one has come to expect in works of this nature. All the more the pity, then, that Collin (2017), cited on p. 27 is omitted altogether from the list. Prior to this, there is a similar issue with Davis (1991) on p. 11, though here one wonders if this is a straightforward mix-up with a character called Davis Knight who is being discussed in the same paragraph. Thirdly, Annelle (1967), cited on p. 13 becomes Annella on p. 31.

Recommended grade: **velmi dobře**

Reviewer: Andrew Tollet

Date: 4th June 2018

Signature:

