

Undergraduate Thesis Assessment Rubric

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

Thesis Author: Hynek Král

Title: Selected Phonological Phenomena Causing Difficulties in Understanding English Spoken Discourse

Length: 30

Text Length: 29

<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 <u>Acceptable</u> Somewhat deficient Very deficient	The Introduction is too short. By its language it reminds a newspaper introductory paragraph of an article rather than an academic piece of text. Some relevant information is missing, e.g. how the goal indicated at the beginning of the chapter has been met, what is the organization of the work like, etc.
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 <u>Very good</u> Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	Appropriate selection of relevant items and explanations Good linking of the ideas Fully informative and a good preparation for the practical part X Some parts present information or even definitions which must have been taken from a source, but the source is not cited, e.g. p. 6.
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 <u>Very good</u> Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	Good illustration of the theory by examples of real misunderstandings X Again, it is not possible that much of the information would not have a source (there is none cited, e.g. p. 21 (Ozzy Osbourne's story)
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	<u>Outstanding</u> Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	A very interesting presentation of practical examples, full of information, with an immediate feedback to the theory
5. Conclusion effectively restates the argument. It summarizes the main findings and follows logically from the analysis presented.	<u>Outstanding</u> Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	Good framing; reference to the goals is made
6. The text is organized in a logical manner. It flows naturally and is easy	<u>Outstanding</u> Very good	Very pleasant to read, stylistically neat language

to follow. Transitions, summaries and conclusions exist as appropriate. The author uses standard spelling, grammar, and punctuation.	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.	<u>Outstanding</u> Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	High standard of the language used.
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.	<u>Outstanding</u> Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	The work is coherent, without useless "decorations",

Final Comments & Questions

The overall impression that the work gives is very positive. It is a text on a high level of language and style. I see only two weak points: firstly, the approach to the practical part and its method should have been explained in the introduction or somewhere appropriate; only after a few pages of the practical part itself it started to be clear that it is intended as an illustration of the theoretical part with examples from real life, from the author's own experience or from the sources. These sources should have been cited more often, especially where it was clear that the information was not the author's invention (see above). The best sides of the work are its coherence, high informative value and also the interesting content, pleasant to read.

Supervisor/Reviewer: Mgr. Naděžda Stašková

Date: 19.5. 2011

Signature:



Západočeská univerzita v Plzni
Fakulta pedagogická
katedra anglického jazyka