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

Thesis Author: Jakub Řehula

Title: FRENCH LOANWORDS IN SAMPLE TEXTS INTENDED FOR ADVANCED ENGLISH LEARNERS

Length: 47 pages

Text Length: 32 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	The introduction is widely unrelated to the practical part. The statement of the problem is unclear as it only mentions self-evident facts.
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	The context is yet again widely unrelated as it comments on the development of English from a too general/broad perspective that is unsuited for such a short study and ignores significant areas that are focused on in the practical part such as principles of vocabulary acquisition.
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**	The chapter called *Methodology* unfortunately does not describe research methodology. It merely describes the transcription of electronic texts and identifying selected words, which would suffice at the level of a specifically aimed semestral paper, however, not at the level of a bachelor thesis. No relevant theory is proposed and applied (e.g., lexical density). It fails to fulfill all the listed criteria as it merely describes and lists the counts of identified words. There is no valid interpretation and no clear tie to the theoretical part. The strengths and weaknesses of the research are not discussed.
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient **Very deficient**	Since the title/topic and aims are not clearly related and there is no valid hypothesis presented it is not possible to identify how the author uses his critical and analytical thinking. The knowledge of the selected area is shallow and not applied adequately.
5. Conclusion effectively restates the argument. It summarizes the main findings and follows logically from the analysis presented.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient	See point 3 and 4

		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**	See comments 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.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient **Very deficient**	See comments 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 **Acceptable** Somewhat deficient Very deficient	The division into section displays great asymmetry between the overly lengthy theoretical part and an extremely short and underinformative practical section.

Final Comments & Questions

In addition to the points mentioned above, the greatest **merit** of the proposed thesis, in my view, lies in the choice of certain topical aspects that have a potential to be explored in the classroom – they are unfortunately not explicitly interpreted, and classroom practice is not clearly tied to the presented findings. I also appreciate the author's clear enthusiasm that propels the otherwise cumbersome progress of the argumentation.

As to the main **weaknesses**, judging by the formulation of the thesis' title and aims (ses *Abstract* and *Introduction*), they are unfortunately in a clear discord. Moreover, the author has chosen a topic that has been so widely researched by the most prominent linguistic experts that it is practically impossible to offer any novel insights. The theoretical part is verbose and widely unconnected to the focus of the practical part, while offering mostly self-evident facts that are often not properly referenced. Given the focus of the theoretical part, it is utterly shocking to read the following statement in the opening section of the Results chapter: *The biggest issue found during the study was that many words that came from French are of Latin origin.* How is such an oversight possible?

The **formulatory level** of the proposed text unfortunately leaves a lot to be desired. Syntactic, morphological, and lexical imprecisions and mistakes appear already in the short section of the Acknowledgements and feature on practically every page of this thesis. Some of this might have been caused by the lack of thorough editing, however, these are mostly systemic errors that display an insufficient level of proficiency.
Most significantly, the lack of the use of adequate terminology (e.g., *some areas of language* – what does the author mean by this? Lexical fields?; what is meant by *borrowing entire terms*?) causes vagueness that hinders a clear delivery of the intended message and makes the thesis a difficult read. In addition, it represents a consistent flouting of the elementary principles of academic writing that should be strictly adhered to in a text of such type.

I propose the following **points for discussion** at the thesis defense:

1/ What does the author perceive as his innovative/authentic insight regarding a topic that has been so thoroughly described by the most prominent representatives of lexicological research in English? In other words, why has he chosen a topic within whose confines he was unable to identify a research question that would have been unanswered by previous research (see e.g., the thesis abstract: *'This paper explores the possibility that some areas of language may have been more influenced by the Romance language family over the course of history...')*?

2/ The thesis hypothesis is formulated as follows: *whether there are certain areas more prone to Romance languages*. Not only is this a question that was clearly answered decades ago, thus it does not propose to test anything new, but it is also not a hypothesis in the sense that as such it would need to propose a relationship between two variables. Could the author try to reformulate his statement so that it can be considered a hypothesis?

3/ There are only three benefits of learning a foreign language listed in thesis: effective communication and increasing employability and earning potential. Apart from these profit-seeking reasons, could the author as a student of a teacher-training programme mention any other reasons that might motivate foreign-language learners?

Based on the reasons stated above I propose the assessment of **4, nedostatečně.**

Reviewer: Klára Lancová

Date: 27th August 2023

Signature: