

Undergraduate Thesis Assessment Rubric

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

Thesis author: Ivan Audes

Title: DIALECT RESEARCH OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

Length: 34

Text length: 32

<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 examined issue. It presents an overview of the thesis.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	
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 Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	
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 Somewhat deficient Very deficient	
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	
5. Conclusion effectively restates the argument. It summarizes the main findings and follows logically from the analysis presented.	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 uses standard spelling, grammar, and punctuation.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	
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	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient	

the student is writing.	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 Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	

Final Comments & Questions

The Introduction is a **decent opening** part of the work, providing all that we expect: explanation of the author's approach to the chosen topic, indication of certain necessary limitations of the research, clear statement of the aims and a brief and clear presentation of the structure of the whole work.

The Theoretical Background contains basic technical terms and their explanation. The chapter is rather brief, but I think it provides at least **basic information needed for the analytical part**. The author introduces the sources; I would appreciate him to provide these references a little more frequently. On the other hand, it is still evident that he does not present the theory as his own invention. The chapter is **easy to follow**; the author proceeds from the most general knowledge to the specific characterization of the main dialects and describes them from the geographical, phonetic, grammatical and lexical points of view. At the same time, he provides **enough exemplifying material** for the reader to make the basic picture of each dialect. The chapter **lacks in an appropriate concluding paragraph** to make the transition to the following chapter smoother.

The same applies to the following chapter, the Analysis, where a proper, stylistically integrated introduction and a short closing paragraph are missing. The author chose several authentic texts to show the features of selected dialect. He shows particular examples of distinctive features on the one hand, and some of the common elements on the other hand. With some varieties he only comments on **certain linguistic levels** (phonetics, grammar), with others he extracts also examples of specific lexicon. This **unbalance** is probably caused by the fact that in the extracts given no specific vocabulary appeared. I especially mean the case of "low" **Cockney**, the rhyming slang, where the lexicon belongs among the essential attributes. Probably one more text of ("low") Cockney should have been supplied showing the special vocabulary of this non-standard sub-dialect. I suppose that some of these missing linguistic levels will be **added in the oral defense**, perhaps by means of some other additional short authentic texts. On the other hand, the reader still gets a number of interesting linguistic phenomena which are felt strange or unusual by the standard language speakers.

In the Conclusion the author summarizes the main findings and **suggests possible deepening /continuation of the present research**.

One of the shortcomings of the work is a **weaker structure of the practical part**, where the individual sections are not properly tied to one another.

Another minor objection of mine is towards the **title** of the work in English; I would prefer, for example, the title "Research of the United Kingdom Dialects".

As for the language, it is overall quite good; there are occasional mistakes, but not many.

Taking into consideration all the positives/problems of the work, I consider this thesis still acceptable and suggest the evaluation: "**dobře**".

Supervisor: PhDr. Naděžda Stašková, PhD.

Date: 17th August 2015

Signature:

