

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

**Thesis Author:** Mária Vacková  
**Title:** Frequent mistakes in pronunciation made by English learners  
**Length:** 49  
**Text Length:** 39

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

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.	<b>Outstanding</b> Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see below
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.	<b>Outstanding</b> Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see below

### Final Comments & Questions

As a potential future English teacher, the student decided to work on a really useful topic – pronunciation. In the Introduction chapter, the author clearly states the goal of the thesis, composed of three interesting questions to answer. She also presents a transparent description of structure of the whole work, including explanations of the reasons for her choice of this particular topic

In the Theoretical Background she starts from the most general areas – phonetics and phonology, not forgetting about the necessary instrument – transcription, as well as about the detailed description of the articulatory tract. In the phonological part, all the segments /phonemes) are classified. Everything is very well organized, however, I really miss a chapter on stress, as the placement of stress is finally mentioned as one of the learners' pronunciation problems.

The Presentation of the research is very successful: the structure of analysis sticks to a regular order and the main pronunciation problems of individual respondents are clearly listed. We can see the full texts used for testing (including their standard pronunciation) in the Appendix.

Based on the careful analysis of the material received from the speakers, the author clearly summarizes the results and fully answers all the research questions.

The form and the language is correct; the style gives an impression of a confident and well-founded attitude. Even with the above mentioned reservation regarding the missing theory on stress, I still consider this work a successful piece of academic work and suggest the evaluation “excellent”.

**Supervisor:** PhDr. Naděžda Stašková, PhD.

**Date:** 30.8.2020

**Signature:**