

Undergraduate Thesis Assessment Rubric
Department of English, Faculty of Education, University of West Bohemia

Thesis Author: **Petra Císlerová**
 Title: *The USA: Many different countries in one – American cuisine*
 Length: 34 pages
 Text Length: 31 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 examined issue. It presents and overview of the thesis.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	See overleaf
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	See overleaf
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	See overleaf
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	See overleaf
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	See overleaf
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 the student is writing.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	See overleaf
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	See overleaf

Final Comments & Questions

This offering hardly qualifies as a proper piece of academic writing, let alone an acceptable final bachelor work. The in-text referencing is almost non-existent so that the list of references at the end, apart from being a complete mess in itself, is actually bogus. Curiously, on those occasions where the author does use an acknowledged direct quote in the main text, she omits the titles from the final list (e.g. Marie Lupo Tusa's cookbook *Marie's Melting Pot* at www.whatscookingamerica.net on pp.11-12, or Arnold Reuben at www.whatscookingamerica.net on pp. 24-25).

The style of writing throughout is much too informal, the effect of which is the register frequently resembles that of a third-rate tourist guidebook – and a badly organised one at that: as a general rule, one would expect the text to lead the reader from the general to the specific but instead, with no obvious explanation, Ms Císlarová decides first to deal with Louisiana in detail and only then introduce the USA as a whole. One wonders whether this was the original intention or whether the author discovered part way through that there was really not so much worth saying about Louisiana after all and still she was several thousand characters short of a thesis. Here and there, the reader is offered some vaguely interesting tidbits, such as the calorie count for two different sizes of cheeseburger (p. 24) or that *in Chicago you can buy a hot dog made of Vienna beef franks and poppy-seed bun, filled with pickle spears, tomato slices, celery salt, onion, mustard and sport peppers* (p. 26). At no stage, however, does the author show the slightest inclination to fit any of her material into even the most nebulous of academic frameworks.

To sum up, the work will need substantial rewriting before it even comes close to meeting the required standards.

Recommended classification: **nevyhověla (fail)**

Reviewer: Andrew Tollet

Date: 1st September 2017

Signature:

