

Undergraduate Thesis Assessment Rubric

Department of English, Faculty of Education, University of West Bohemia

Thesis Author: **Daniel H R O N**

Title: Applied Scholastic and its Use in LITE English School Pilsen: Interaction Analysis

Length: 76

Text Length: 55

<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 <u>Very good</u> Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	The Introduction informs the reader about the author's quite ambitious research goal and also provides the overview of individual sections.
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 <u>Very good</u> Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	The work demonstrates a great deal of research and investigation. I appreciate the variety and number of relevant resources the author uses. He presents the huge amount of far too detailed information. Fortunately this is done in a logical manner, enabling the reader to get the idea of the topic and the contents. However, we can only guess where some information is taken from as the source is not always mentioned, e.g. info on different methods provided on pages 6-7.
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	The practical part is very descriptive and the author discusses his data collection methods in great detail allowing for no doubts about the quality of the gathered data. This part made me wonder whether the whole range of research tools was needed and that beneficial. To the primary goal of the research (interaction analysis) the reader gets only on p.42. Here the author brings a detailed session plan and even though he analyses every micro-stage, no summary is provided at the end. The findings are used for planning and implementing a new session. The conclusion is based on students' feedback which is not printed in this work but presented on the CD only.
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Outstanding <u>Very good</u> Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	The author is trying to incorporate the ideas of the sources into the main idea of the paper and but the quoted information presented is not always effectively commented on.

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	
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	
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 <u>Very good</u> Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	Overall, this work carefully researched and clearly written.
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	Technically speaking, I think that because of the author's very ambitious research goal, this work is far too long and exceeds the recommended lengths (19 343 words). Furthermore, the formatting of sections is a bit off and does not always conform to the general requirements, e.g. chapters do not start on a new page, a jump to a different (smaller) font is seen on p.6 then back to the bigger one on p. 13, the Czech Summary is included before Appendices instead after them.

Final Comments & Questions

On the whole, this is a solid piece of work which shows the author's researching abilities. As already mentioned above, the thesis is far too detailed, but precise and carefully worked out. In my opinion it is quite a good piece of academic writing.

Questions:

Could you briefly summarize the clear goal of your project and the main findings?

Reviewer: Mgr Danuše Hurtová

Date: 17 August 2012

Signature: 