

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

Thesis Author: Margarita Kuliková
 Title: Reading and reading strategies in language classes
 Length: 129
 Text Length: 41

Assessment Criteria	Scale	Comments
1. Introduction is well written, brief, interesting, and compelling. It motivates the work and provides a clear statement of the problem. It places the problem in context. It presents and overview of the thesis.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	Informative enough X stylistically weaker.
2. Literature review is comprehensive and complete. It synthesizes a variety of sources and provides context for the research. It shows the author's understanding of the most relevant literature on the subject matter.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	The number of sources is sufficient and includes both general methodology materials and specific reading instructions. Formal remark: the tense used with paraphrasing someone's ideas (from the sources) should be present simple rather than past, for the ideas presented are not bound to a particular past time – they are actually timeless in this type of presentation. (Ex.: p.4: "Scriver stated that the reader..."; "Harmer completed that ...") Sometimes, the transition between individual subchapters is not smooth enough, e.g. p.7 – <i>Schema theory in ESL reading</i> comes without any linking remark. Similarly, e.g., p. 14 <i>Extensive reading</i> . To a certain extent, the text lacks coherence, although it brings a fairly large amount of information.
3. The methodology chapter provides clear and thorough description of the research methodology. It discusses why and what methods were chosen for research. The research methodology is appropriate for the identified research questions.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	The chapter is very well-organized, it is comprehensive and clear; it is rich in information.
4. The results/data are analyzed and interpreted effectively. The chapter ties the theory with the findings. It addresses the applications and implications of the research. It discusses strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of the research.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	The results successfully refer to individual areas of the theory and are presented in detail. The parts are accompanied by well-designed graphs; unfortunately, the titles of the graphs are not sometimes consistent with the information given and thus confusing, e.g. p. 29: <i>Pre-reading stage vs. Activation of background knowledge</i> ;

		<i>Reading stage vs. Silent reading X Reading aloud BUT p. 30 Post-reading stage vs. Post-reading stage (=correct). The commentary of the results seems effective, especially when the author uses the results of the research in implications for teaching as the starting point of various recommendations.</i>
5. The thesis shows critical and analytical thinking about the area of study and the author's expertise in this area.	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 demonstrates high quality writing skills and uses standard spelling, grammar, and punctuation.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	Stylistic mistakes (clumsy formulations), e.g. wrong coordination of dependent clauses or sentence elements – p. 1: <i>"Since ... instructions, explanations, and individual examples...have specific features and in order to gain needed information... readers should apply different reading strategies."</i> Similarly: <i>"What the results signify and additional advice for teaching are presented in the following chapter."</i> Wrong punctuation, e.g. comma before pronoun "that" in restrictive relative clauses. Sometimes a mistake as a result of an oversight, e.g. a doubled subject, p. 26: <i>"During the lessons...students, who were taught by Mgr. R.E., students were working..."</i> Occasionally typing errors.
7. 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	The theoretical chapter is stylistically weaker. Otherwise, the work is fairly decent.

Final Comments & Questions

The author's writing skills need some improvement; on the other hand the content of the work and active approach in the practical part indicate her enthusiasm and interest in methodology of ELT.
The evaluation suggested: "very good".

Supervisor/Reviewer: PhDr. Naděžda Stašková, PhD.

Date: 19.8.2013

Signature: 