

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

Thesis Author: Eva Michalová

Title: THE LANGUAGE OF ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION

Length: 56

Text Length: 43

<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 Very good <u>Acceptable</u> Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see final comments down the page
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 <u>Acceptable</u> Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see final comments down the page
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 <u>Very good</u> Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see final comments down the page
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Outstanding <u>Very good</u> Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see final comments down the page
5. Conclusion effectively restates the argument. It summarizes the main findings and follows logically from the analysis presented.	Outstanding <u>Very good</u> Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see final comments down the page
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 <u>Somewhat deficient</u> Very deficient	see final comments down the page
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 <u>Acceptable</u> Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see final comments down the page

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 <u>Acceptable</u> Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see final comments down the page"
---	---	-----------------------------------

Final Comments & Questions

The author has chosen a topic which is contemporary and useful, but at the same time not very easy to process. The Introduction seems a little disorganised in some places due to repeating some concepts and listing the subchapters; it should have been more coherent and clearer to read.

The initial discussion of the Theoretical Background chapter about the order of written and spoken medium is not inevitable, not very relevant. The description of the two media, on the other hand is well-chosen from the literature and clearly presented in a chart. I could do without subchapters 2.1.2 (Medium) and 2.1.2 (Function), as they seem redundant considering the previous detailed comparison. In the following text of the chapter, the author starts with the idea of English as a global language and gradually comes to the main focus of the work – electronic communication, where she brings some interesting information about this specific language. In my opinion, she sometimes focuses her attention on basic explanations too much, e.g. what idioms are, which should not be taken as the target but as a generally known concept used here as part of a deeper insight. In the survey of acronym examples, I would expect a record of pronunciation as this is what differentiates them from abbreviations. I find the list of Textese expressions far too long – a limited representative collection of examples would be sufficient. At the end of the chapter, the concluding paragraph is missing, which makes the chapter somehow “unfinished”.

The Method chapter introduces the procedure of the research quite well, except for the rather vague description of the respondents. In addition, practical analysis should have been presented in a separate chapter. Furthermore, it says that there are 80 examples, but I am rather confused – there are many more (?). There is a good graphical connection of the examples extracted from authentic texts and the texts themselves (in Appendix) – the bold print in full texts enables better orientation in the context of the examples. Presentation of the questionnaire is very good and clear. Each answer is properly summarised and illustrated in a graph..

The Conclusion closes the work quite successfully, I appreciate suggestions for teaching practice.

Summary in Czech is usually placed at the very end of work, while here it precedes the appendices. I am not sure if all the appendices are necessary, I especially doubt relevance of the first one.

As for the language, there are sometimes useless mistakes, which seem to be the result of lower attention to the grammatical correctness. Examples: p. 2 – the sentence starting in “*The American linguist Leonard Bloomfield...*” we can find inconsistency of the verb and subject /subject complement. The same applies, e.g. to p. 29 - in describing the ellipsis. The use of language is sometimes a little confusing, especially as a result of incorrect punctuation or missing conjunctions, e.g. p. 1 in the sentence “*The enclosed samples used...*”, it is not clear if only the messages are written by non-native speakers or if this applies to all the types of texts.

The work gives an impression of the author being involved in English linguistics, on the other hand, it seems that she has certain difficulties to organise the written text in a clear and more transparent way. She has a lot of ideas in mind but not always she is able to distinguish what is less / more important.

The thesis has certain shortcomings, which, I suppose, the author is able to comment on. The careful approach to the research is apparent, but its written presentation is a little weaker.

I am convinced that her oral performance to defend the work will be much better, and I suggest evaluation “good” (“dobře”).

Supervisor: PhDr. Naděžda Stašková, Ph.D.

Date: August 31 2019

Signature:

