

# Undergraduate Thesis Assessment Rubric (Linguistics)

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

Thesis Author: Eliška Pořvková

Title: Linguistic Analysis of Lyrics in Contemporary Modern Music

Length: 118 pages

Text Length: 35 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 research question(s) and the aim of the thesis. It presents an overview of the thesis.   | <b>Outstanding</b><br>Very good<br>Acceptable<br>Somewhat deficient<br>Very deficient | The reviewer agrees in all the listed criteria.<br>The only critical comment could be raised in the case of the hypothesis formulation- in this case, the five mentioned areas on page 2 are rather research statements than full-fledged hypotheses.   |
| 2. The theoretical part shows the author's appropriate theoretical 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.   | Outstanding<br><b>Very good</b><br>Acceptable<br>Somewhat deficient<br>Very deficient | As this is the single weak spot of the text, the reviewer's main reservation concerns a missing reference to a robust body of research that has been done on the ideology of language standard (see e.g. Lesley and James Milroy), which would render the theoretical background of this paper complete and more authoritative. Also, most of the references are not recent (although understandably the canon of grammatical bibliography does not change significantly over time) and rather limited in number. |
| 3. The Practical Part comprises three main sections: a/description of the analyzed language material/retrieval of corpus, b/ methodology used, and c/results. The methodology used in data collection and subsequent analysis are described adequately. The analysis itself highlights the relevant issues and covers them in sufficient detail. The results are presented in a clear and logical manner that displays the application of the theoretical concepts. | <b>Outstanding</b><br>Very good<br>Acceptable<br>Somewhat deficient<br>Very deficient | The practical part would benefit from a more conclusive summary of the extensive results that could be contextualised within the sociolinguistic conceptual framework. However, this relates to the aforementioned missing reference to a large body of theoretical work on standard vs non-standard language ideology.   |
| 4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic  | <b>Outstanding</b><br>Very good   | The author refers to her theoretical sources amply and  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| description or summary of information.   | Acceptable<br>Somewhat deficient<br>Very deficient                                    | uses them in her interpretation adequately.  |
| 5. Conclusion effectively restates the issue. It summarizes the main findings and follows logically from the analysis presented. Moreover, it discusses the potential strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of the research.                    | Outstanding<br><b>Very good</b><br>Acceptable<br>Somewhat deficient<br>Very deficient | Apart from the missing comments on the potential limitations, strengths and weaknesses of the thesis, and a possible extension of the research, the conclusion fulfills its purpose. |
| 6. The text is coherent; it is organized in a logical manner, flows naturally and is easy to follow. This includes standard spelling, grammar, and punctuation. Transitions, summaries and conclusions exist as appropriate.                     | Outstanding<br>Very good<br>Acceptable<br>Somewhat deficient<br>Very deficient        | The author has made concerted effort to create an easily navigable and reader-friendly document that complies with the academic writing guidelines.                                  |
| 7. The author demonstrates proficient use of language in a way suitable for the discipline and/or genre.   | Outstanding<br><b>Very good</b><br>Acceptable<br>Somewhat deficient<br>Very deficient | Apart from minor slips of final editing imprecision in the use of the category of definiteness and often overburdened sentence structure, I do not find grounds for criticism.       |
| 8. The thesis meets the general requirements (formatting, chapters, length, division into sections, etc.). References are cited properly within the text, a complete reference list is provided, and the use of A acknowledged (if appropriate). | Outstanding<br>Very good<br>Acceptable<br>Somewhat deficient<br>Very deficient        | The overall length and precision of the attached material clearly surpasses standard requirements.   |

#### Final Comments & Questions

In her proposed thesis, Eliška Polívková undertakes an uneasy task of analysing popular song lyrics from a primarily syntactic and secondarily sociolinguistic perspective. The greatest merit, in my view, is represented by the marriage of creativity and inventiveness of the original idea and research design, and the precision of its execution. It is rather unfortunate that the reader is not provided with a more extensive interpretative section, as the breadth of the presented analysis would deserve.

As the thesis displays exemplary attitude to academic work in most of the aspects required at the bachelor's level (see table above), I **recommend** it for defence and leave the final assessment upon the discretion of the defence committee.

I suggest that the author comment on the following points during the defence discussion

1/ What did the author base her expectations of gender differences in pop lyrics on? Specifically, the assumption that female lyrics will be more tender.

2/ Which aspect of the analysed corpus presented the greatest challenge for interpretation and why?

3/ Does the author see any potential classroom implications ensuing her research results?

**Reviewer:** Klára Lanová

**Date:** 27 May, 2024

**Signature:**