

Undergraduate Thesis Assessment Rubric

Department of English, Faculty of Education, University of West Bohemia

Thesis Author: Filip Jirovy

Title: Politeness Theory Project: The Remains of the Day and Twelfth Night.

Length: 41

Text Length: 42

<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 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	

Final Comments & Questions

As with the author's first attempt at defense, I feel a little perplexed I was not consulted about the text nor have I seen a draft of the diploma since our initial discussion last year. The text is much improved since the author's previous effort, but I must leave the fate of the project solely in the hands of the opponent. I am disappointed there are still so many format problems with the text including inverted apostrophes and quotations marks, misspellings, spacing mistakes, and irregularities in the References. The extremely long paragraphs are also a bit bizarre if not difficult to read. The author never gets the hang of writing about the two primary texts *Remains of the Day* and *Twelfth Night* simultaneously and never seems to be able to make a coherent point about the way face works in both texts, say in terms of the sartorial metaphors employed in each, i.e. Steven's suit of dignity vs Malvolio's disheveled yellow stocking cross gartered. This is not to say there is no observation about the function of face. Indeed, there are many keen observations, but these are never rolled up into the ball of a more important argument. Even in the conclusion the author separates his summation of the two texts. I was disappointed that the author could not glean more culture context for the Brown and Gilman text and the Magnusson text and instead used them mostly as reference material for the structural function of politeness theory. That is what Brown and Levinson is for. Again, I had my own ideas about the composition of the diploma, and the opponent may not be as concerned as to what the director interprets as swerves and veers from the potential of the project. The director suggests a mark of 3, but will be open to the guidance of the opponent as to what mark the author ultimately deserves.

Supervisor/Reviewer: Brad Vice, Ph.D.

Date:

29.08.22

Signature: