

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

Thesis Author: **Ludmila Tomanová**
 Title: *The Cricketer as a Symbol of the English Gentleman*
 Length: 32 pages
 Text Length: 29 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	
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 the student is writing.	Outstanding Very good 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 Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	

The first thing to say about this work is that it shows all the signs of having been completed in haste. The result is that some sections appear to be almost like the result of brainstorming or a series of notes to be fleshed out and analysed in more detail later. In principle, the idea of analysing the cultural significance of cricket from a historical perspective is a good one, since the game in many ways encapsulates much that has traditionally been considered typical of the English character. Had the author stuck to this aim more rigidly, the overall result might have made easier reading. Instead, though, she starts by trying to explain in the sketchiest of outlines the most fundamental principles of the game. Now, obviously the arcane cricketing vocabulary is complicated and hard to navigate for anyone unfamiliar with its various nuances; it is just a pity the author runs into such serious trouble almost immediately (p. 2) when attempting to deal with the *general rules and game system*. The first paragraph in this section contains so many inaccuracies in a mere 10 lines that it is impossible to correct all of them in the space available here, so the list below is only a sample:

- (a) to suggest the ball is *thrown by a bowler* is quite wrong; on the contrary, throwing by the bowler (or “chucking” as it is referred to colloquially) is in direct contravention of the rules and results in one run being added to the total of the batting team. Moreover, any bowler who repeatedly chucks may even find himself being banned from bowling completely.
- (b) unless we are dealing with the informal tip-and-run form of cricket, common in school playgrounds and PE lessons, the batsman is under no compulsion to run after hitting the ball: this is one of the most fundamental differences between cricket and baseball, as well as one of the main reasons why, to the uninitiated, cricket can often appear so tedious.
- (c) teams do not change after finishing overs; moreover, as implied in (a) above, an over does not consist of six “throws”: the correct term would be “balls” or “deliveries”.
- (d) the term “inning” is confined to baseball; in cricket it is always “innings”, even if referring only to one of them.

Having been confronted with something like this so early on in the text, the reader might be forgiven for regarding anything that follows with a certain degree of circumspection. As it happens, there are no similar examples of so many glaring errors in such quick succession; however, cohesion remains a constant problem throughout the main text. One example is on p. 8, where at first reading it might appear that 17th century English aristocrats condemned bodyline bowling, when in fact this was a tactic first employed by England captain Douglas Jardine against the Australians in the 1930s. A second example is p. 10 with its numerous short paragraphs: if nothing else, the description of the author eating her lunch next to a statue of W.G. Grace could probably have been omitted.

From the formal point of view, there are some problems with the list of references: the Chaloun entry appears in Czech alphabetical order but not English, while the Malcolm (2013) entry is repeated. On the other hand, Brian Stoddart is not listed at all, though perhaps this is unsurprising since the reference on p. 7 is one of the vaguest one has yet encountered in a work of this nature: *Brian Stoddart, former historian, somewhere once said, [sic] that ...*

Despite all the above shortcomings, the author does deserve credit both for embarking on such an ambitious project in the first place and for the amount of effort she has put into the background research. Had there been more time available for reflection and revision, one senses the final version of the work would not have appeared so disjointed. With this in mind, the grade suggested below could be subject to modification depending on the oral defence.

Recommended grade: **dobře**

Supervisor: Andrew Tollet

Date: 5th June 2018

Signature:

