

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

Thesis Author: Zuzana Jenčíková
 Title: Developing Autonomy in Secondary School Language Learners
 Length: 59 pages
 Text Length: 50 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 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	
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	
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	

<p>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.</p>	<p>Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient</p>	

Final Comments & Questions

This is well-researched work, though the final version would have benefited from a more meticulous proof-reading. While the majority of the mistakes do not hinder comprehension, there are enough of them to become a distraction.

Otherwise, I particularly appreciate the author's acknowledgment of the all too common discrepancy between methodological theory and practical reality: "I am not sure if it is possible to satisfy all students' requirements at the same time" (p. 42), or "I think if students do not want to work on their own, the efforts of teachers could be without effect" (p. 43).

Questions and comments

p. 3 What is meant by "not unborn matter"?

p. 5 Is it really the case – as claimed by Schwienerhorst (2009) – that, without a teacher, it is only possible to learn a foreign language to a certain degree? Experience has shown that, given sufficient exposure, children placed in a foreign language environment will pick up the language of their hosts very quickly and often display a communicative competence superior to that of adults in a similar situation. Or is there a methodological distinction here between 'learning' and 'acquisition'?

p. 12 In the context of the four types of students, it is not clear 100% clear what the difference is between *accommodators* and *assimilators*.

Recommended grade: Excellent

Reviewer: Andrew Tollet

Date: 19th August 2013

Signature:

