

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

Thesis Author: Kamila Švajcrová

Title: British English dialects with focus on dialects of Sussex and Kent

Length: 60 pages

Text Length: 44 pages

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

Final Comments & Questions

In the Introduction the author clearly explains her intentions and gives the reasons for her choice of topic. The structure of the work is introduced in a transparent way briefly describing all the parts of the thesis.

In the Theoretical chapter are some imperfections that should be mentioned. I appreciate the description of the historical development of English as well as a survey of various influences throughout history. These historical facts usefully make the extra-linguistic background for the matter of the work. However, the subchapter on Modern English has rather got out of the author's control, drowning itself in a number of too specific linguistic disciplines introducing tiny details of the system. Instead, the author should have concentrate on such categories which are essential in relation to the dialects examined. A similar approach is observable with the detailed description of dialects, some of which are also rather far from those of the main interest (e.g. "Low Cockney"). The subchapter on dialects of Kent and Sussex offers a clear description of their features and supplies a reasonable number of examples.

In the practical part, the author first introduces hypotheses which demonstrate the aim of the thesis. I consider the choice of the focus on advanced learners' comprehension skills (regarding the relation of the Standard English and the given dialects) really topical and appreciate the link to the practical use of English by L2 speakers. The research is well-structured. The author realizes limitations and suggest further possible extension of the study.

The Results and Commentary chapter presents the main findings clearly and illustrates the results in clear graphs. The Conclusion chapter summarizes the research and successfully refers to the hypotheses, introducing clear answers the research question. The chapter is fairly well written, I only think that the summary of what was presented in the theoretical chapter is rather redundant here.

The language and style are very good; the format of presentation of the sources, however, is not entirely correct.

Based on the above commentaries, I suggest the evaluation "very good" (velmi dobře).

Supervisor: PhDr. Naděžda Stašková, PhD.

Date 29th August 2023

Signature: