

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


Thesis Author: **Bc. Markéta Čonková**
 Title: **Using Mobile Technologies in English Language Teaching**
 Length: 93 pages
 Text Length: 58 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 problem. It places the problem in context. It presents an overview of the thesis.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	The Introduction describes the organization of the work and presents the reasons for the choice of the topic. It is stylistically simple but acceptable. I think that the research question(s) could have been formulated more transparently and directly.
2. Literature review is comprehensive and complete. It synthesizes a variety of sources and provides context for the research. It shows the author's understanding of the most relevant literature on the subject matter.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	The beginning of the theoretical chapter perhaps aimed at the definition of mobile learning; however here the reader does not actually get any clear explanation of the concept (which is the centre of interest in the whole thesis). I would expect a proper and comprehensible definition first and only then the description of various approaches. Also, the prevailing number of citations regarding mobile learning are based on one or two sources (mainly Traxler, 2009), which as a result gives an impression of a sort of continuous presentation of his work.
3. The methodology chapter provides clear and thorough description of the research methodology. It discusses why and what methods were chosen for research. The research methodology is appropriate for the identified research questions.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	The introductory part of the chapter is rather "talkative" and therefore less transparent. The methods, subjects and research itself are described carefully. At least a little brief piece of information on the types of activities would make the chapter more complete.
4. The results/data are analyzed and interpreted effectively. The chapter ties the theory with the findings. It addresses the applications and implications of the research. It discusses strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of the research.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	The chapter is marked by the author's effort to be as particular as possible, and it is completed by a number of sophisticated graphs; however some of the graphs seem to me not very clear; also such a high number is not very much to the thesis' benefit. The presentation of the results is to a certain extent ponderous and less dynamic. The chapter could have been shorter but more effective.
5. The thesis shows critical and analytical	Outstanding	Despite certain imperfections given

thinking about the area of study and the author's expertise in this area.	Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	above, the work shows the author's honest effort to cover all the aspects and details of the research and its results.
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 demonstrates high quality writing skills and uses standard spelling, grammar, and punctuation.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	Sometimes less transparent (see above). The language is acceptable, sometimes not perfectly correct, the main problems being the structure of complex sentences, prepositional phrases, articles and relative pronouns.
7. 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 thesis is based on a startlingly low number of references (!), which I consider as unacceptable for this type of academic writing.

Final Comments & Questions

To sum up, the author seems to be fond of the topic and her effort is visible. The "talkative" and long-winded style is, in my opinion, the matter of low experience, and definitely may be improved in the future. Regarding the above mentioned objections, the suggested mark is "good".

Supervisor/Reviewer:  PhDr. Naděžda Stašková, PhD.

Date: 18 August.2014

Signature: 