

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

Thesis Author: Lucie Hrachovinová
Title: Translation of songs from English into Czech and the used language means
Length: 52
Text Length: 48

<i>Assessment Criteria</i>	<i>Scale</i>	<i>Comments</i>
1. Introduction is well written, brief, interesting, and compelling. It motivates the work and provides a clear statement of the examined issue. It presents an overview of the thesis.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see below
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 below
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 below
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see below
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 below
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 below

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 below
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 below

Final Comments & Questions

The student's choice of topic essentially meets two understandable targets: her enthusiasm for music and her linguistic interests.

The aim of the research in the Introduction could have been formulated rather more transparently – this way it seems that the frequency of occurrence somewhat overlaps in two research tasks.

The Theoretical chapter brings explanations and concepts of the main terms. However, occasionally, there are some problems in the structure of the presentation. This is, e.g., the case of types of meaning, out of which three are anticipated, but subsequently only two are introduced (the collocational one is missing).

The described phenomenon in subchapter 2.4. Sense relations, is only one specific case of what may happen with the meaning of a word according to the sentence grammar used (e.g. passive vs. active). What was expected here is a general concept of the term "sense relations". Not all of syntagmatic relations are mentioned, but presentation of four main seems sufficient. Unfortunately, the content of the subchapters is rather purely organized, covers only certain aspects and gives rather chaotic impression (e.g. minor type of polyantonymy listed as first, earlier than the most significant types – gradable and non-gradable antonyms. In addition, definition of homonyms seems insufficient – it is practically identical with that of homophones. Polysemy chapter also contains a number of unclear statements. Often a proper transition from a paragraph to another is missing, the ideas sometimes make an impression of a list.

The alphabetical order of the figures is a good decision – the survey is more transparent. The number of figures is large enough to prepare the reader for the Practical part.

In the Method chapter, the author explains why she chose amateur translations instead of official versions – the different aims of each type (conveying content vs. singability). As I understood, she possibly wanted to keep the contents of the compared versions as close as possible as she mainly examined the language. This is not a bad idea, however, I think that she might have emphasized this intention better within the formulation of the aims of the thesis.

The Practical part seems much more successful than the Theory. The author presents the material and its analysis in a consistent way, following a regular clear method. Added facts about authors and circumstances are useful. The description of figures is clear and accessible.

The work is well concluded including commentaries of possible reasons for the findings. Also the careful graphs are supporting comprehensibility of the main results.

In summary, what I see is a rather unbalanced piece of work with a rather poor theoretical base on the one hand and a fairly well-mastered analysis and presentation of the research and its main findings.

The evaluation suggested: *very good / good* depending on the oral performance.

Supervisor: PhDr. Naděžda Stašková, PhD.

Date: 30.8.2020

Signature: