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

Thesis Author: Martin Veselý

Title: CQ EXPLORATION IN THE US WITH FOCUS IN BUSINESS

Length: 47pp

Text Length: 45pp

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.	Very good	
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).	Acceptable	
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.	Acceptable	
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Very good	
5. Conclusion effectively restates the argument. It summarizes the main findings and follows logically from the analysis presented.	Acceptable	
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.	Very good	In general the level of the English is quite high.
7. The language use is precise. The student makes proficient use of language in a way that is appropriate	Very good	

for the discipline and/or genre in which the student is writing.		
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.	**Very deficient**	The Czech summary is missing. The Works Cited list follows no consistent stylesheet. The references are not provided properly in the text (for instance, p. 11 has a quote from "Livermore 2008", but there is no reference that matches in the bibliography, neither is a page number give; another example, on p. 10 a hyperlink is given in-text as a reference).

Final Comments & Questions

This is an interesting undergraduate work that takes the idea of Cultural Intelligence and applies it to a data set that the author knows intimately, i.e., his own experience. The work begins by describing this idea, mainly through a summary of David Livermore's writing. Often this is done without much critical distance, for example no criticisms of the theory are referred to, and on occasion chapter sections are made up mostly of quotation and restatement of aspects of CQ. Also, when the author came to analyze his data after the theoretical section, a lot of the distinctions in CQ theory fell by the wayside in favour of more general remarks on the difference between cultures in the given situation.

That the author draws on his own experience creates some of the strengths and weaknesses of the work. First the former. The author vividly describes situations and encounters during his time working in a linecook in a restaurant in New Jersey. This workplace becomes a crucible in which to examine cultural interactions between Czechs, US citizens (of unspecified ethnicity and background, like Phil), and Mexicans. However, this leads to a weakness: to what degree is the author's experience indicative of broader patterns? The data is not backed up by sociological studies, for instance. Moreover, no mention is made of the Mexicans' legal status: it could be that their behavior in the restaurant has less to do with any putative traits of their culture than with their position in the US. If a Mexican were working in a restaurant in Guatemala, the behavior might be very different. Restricting himself to his own experience, the author makes it difficult to analyse this kind of issue. It is difficult to generalize interculturally from such a small data set.

A further issue is that the research goal does not seem appropriate for a BA thesis. Here is the author's statement: "The main purpose of this thesis is to provide the readers with a guide that includes information applicable when working in the United States of America and give general advice how to adapt one's behaviour according to the country they are visiting and become more successful and efficient in intercultural interactions" (from the abstract). I would argue that academic works at this level are *not* supposed to provide handbooks of this kind. Handbooks can be and are written on the basis of academic research, but that is something different.

If it seems that I am being too critical here, it is only because I am holding the author to the high standard of engagement and critical thinking that he displayed in the preceding in ADGS. It was a pleasure to have his contributions to discussions, and I hold him in high regard.

A final point: as noted above, the author has not attended carefully to the formal aspects of the thesis. I propose that the thesis not be accepted until these are corrected. Then I would be happy to award it the grade of **2 (velmi dobře)**.

Reviewer:　　　doc. Justin Quinn Ph.D.