

Undergraduate Thesis Assessment Rubric

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

Thesis Author: Tomáš LIDINSKÝ

Title: Scottish Nationalism and its Manifestations

Length: 36

Text Length: 33

Assessment Criteria	Scale	Comments
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 undoubtedly brief, but in fact consists of little more than a retelling of the contents page.
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 <u>Acceptable</u> Somewhat deficient Very deficient	At a glance, the references seem to be rich, but not always balanced – several subchapters e.g. seem to be based on a tourist guide (Tomes).
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 <u>Somewhat deficient</u> Very deficient	Little analysis involved.
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable <u>Somewhat deficient</u> Very deficient	ditto
5. Conclusion effectively restates the argument. It summarizes the main findings and follows logically from the analysis presented.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable <u>Somewhat deficient</u> Very deficient	Again, brevity seems to be the chief quality of this chapter.
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 <u>Somewhat deficient</u> Very deficient	In general, the thesis seems rather incoherent – consisting of three independent parts.

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 <u>Very good</u> 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 <u>Very good</u> Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	

Final Comments & Questions

A substantial part of the thesis is actually an overview of the history of Scotland – a discourse of a rather general nature, including periods with little or no relevance to the notion on nationalism (prehistoric and Celtic Scotland), while the 20th and 21st centuries are dealt with in less than a dozen lines – mentioning in the first place the end of the schism of the Church of Scotland rather than the foundation of the SNP.

The research in itself is a valuable and enriching component of the thesis – but some of the responses could have been taken into consideration when introducing the “symbols” of Scotland (or expressions of Scottish tradition) - e.g. ceilidh might be worth a few words for the uninitiated.

Also I was hoping to find at least a mention of the Sobieski-Stuart brother in relation to the tartan topic.

Generally speaking, the thesis title seems to be a bit mismatched – it is actually more about scottish history, “symbols” and personalities than the concept of nationalism and its specific manifestations in Scotland (as a “stateless nation”).

As such, I would regard the thesis as good – unless the defense proves that the author deserves a better mark.

Reviewer: Magdaléna Potočňáková, Ph.D.

Date: 10. 5. 2014

Signature:

