

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

Thesis Author: Tereza Kadlecová
 Title: Orphans in English Children's Literature
 Length: 56
 Text Length: 41

<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 problem. It places the problem in context. It presents and overview of the thesis.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	
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	By far the strongest part of the thesis was ch. 2, "Theoretical Background". Here the student ably ranges through a number of psychological and methodological texts, drawing interesting conclusions along the way. I was especially struck by the inclusion of superheroes in the category of orphans.
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	In general, I could not grasp what question the student was researching in the thesis. In her conclusion, the student sates that "The thesis investigated the application of teaching literature in [the] ESL classroom" (p. 41). This is a worthy research goal, and I also appreciate that the student carried out the research under difficult conditions, which, as she notes, affected her results. However, given this research goal above, I cannot see the relevance of the long passage (pp. 25–36) where the Ms. Kadlecová tabulated the responses of the students to the literary texts they encountered. This would have been more appropriate for a thesis investigating students' perceptions of literary characters, and not the effectivity of a particular ESL technique (i.e., one that involves literary texts). The thesis writer should instead have measured the skills the students

		learned from this technique, in comparison with other techniques. I realize that this is perhaps beyond the scope of such a work, but the logic of the research goal that the student sets at the beginning begs this question.
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	
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	As I remarked above, this is especially strong in ch. 2.
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	Given the caveat above, this is more or less acceptable in the thesis.
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	Punctuation around intext references is frequently incorrect (e.g., p. 8). The titles of long texts frequently remain unitalicized.

Final Comments & Questions

I recommend the grade of **3** for this thesis, with the possibility of moving it to **2**, depending on the student's response to my point #3 above.

Supervisor/Reviewer: doc. Justin Quinn Ph.D.

Date: 13 May 2014

Signature:

