

## Undergraduate Thesis Assessment Rubric

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

Thesis Author: Lenka Šlechtová  
 Title: Humour in The Canterbury Tales  
 Length: 33  
 Text Length: 31

<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 and overview of the thesis.	Outstanding <b>Very good</b> 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 <b>Very good</b> 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 <b>Acceptable</b> Somewhat deficient Very deficient	In some places, the author tends to use generalizing phrases without direct relevance to the issue of humour (e.g. last paragraph p. 7)  It is often claimed, that Chaucer was a great humorist, but not always successfully demonstrated by the text
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Outstanding Very good <b>Acceptable</b> Somewhat deficient Very deficient	There are sections of mere retelling in the work /namely in the "Knight's Tale"
5. Conclusion effectively restates the argument. It summarizes the main findings and follows logically from the analysis presented.	Outstanding Very good <b>Acceptable</b> Somewhat deficient Very deficient	Again, the conclusion seems to repeat general statements about Chaucer...
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 <b>Very good</b> 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 <b>Very good</b> 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 Very good <b>Acceptable</b> Somewhat deficient Very deficient	>Italics, inverted commas missing in the introduction >a single line on p.2! A different font is used for bibliography? – alias references

#### Final Comments & Questions

The first thing to be appreciated about this thesis is the author's courage to deal with such a demanding text and her effort to find aspects relevant and enjoyable for a contemporary reader (e.g.p.3). Still, some of her assertions, seem to present rather simplified views. Namely e.g.

A) In the Introduction ... considering the potential readership of *CT* in Chaucer's time – how likely is it, that he really could/wanted to “educate, open eyes and prevent blind obedience of the ruling classes”?

B) There seems to be a bit of a contradiction between repeated statements concerning Chaucer's criticism of (namely) the Church as an institution and the more plausible observation mentioned on p. 4, that he makes more fun of its individual representatives. Similarly the mentioned issue of patriarchy/feminism.

The chapters “Humour in Chaucer” and “Humour in ‘The General Prologue’” sound more convincing and better formulated, although and perhaps because of, relying on authorities drawn on and referred to. Of the individual tales chosen for closer analysis, the “Wife of Bath's Tale” seems the most accomplished although a lot more could have been written. “The Knight's Tale”, rather surprisingly chosen for the discussion of humour in *CT*, unfortunately, consists largely of a mere retelling of the plot. The “Miller's” and “Reeve's” tales are on the other hand, treated rather briefly in one chapter.

There is still a potential not quite developed in parts dealing with the film adaptations of *CHT*.

A fine observation made by the author is the distinction between Chaucer the character/pilgrim and Chaucer the narrator. It seems worth considering how much the way **how** the tales are presented (narrated) contributes to their humorous character.

With respect to the complexity of the topic and the difficulty it presents for a bachelor student, the thesis deserves to be assessed as a (very) good work – depending on how persuasive the oral defense will be.

Supervisor: Magdaléna Potočňáková, Ph.D.

Date: 20<sup>th</sup> August 2017

Signature:

