

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

Thesis Author: Gabriela Kašpárková

Title: CLIL – Material development and use: Implementation of grammar in CLIL materials

Length: 80 pages

Text Length: 63 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 problem. It places the problem in context. It presents and overview of the thesis.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	The author talks about CLIL in her first paragraph; however, what it is comes later. Uninformed readers may not know what the author is referring to until the end of the 2 nd paragraph.
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 author covers a number of issues that are connected to the topic of the thesis yet not of any immediate relevance (e.g. pp. 14-17, 17-20, 24-26). The theory section could have been thematically more narrow and stay within the topic of teaching grammar in content driven instruction.
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 author is very descriptive of some aspects of her research yet at the same time, she lacks some other ones. For example, the criteria used in the analysis are only broadly mentioned. For instance, scaffolding (p. 27) can have multiple forms yet the author doesn't clearly state what elements she includes in the term with respect to materials. It is very likely that this issue is tight to the theoretical part where certain elements are only talked about in a general manner. The same applies to the gap-fill element. There is a range of gap fill activities of various levels of complexity and it isn't clear which exactly were considered in the research. Although the info presented on pp. 34-44 is more in the category of findings rather than research design. The author tries to focus on a number of criteria in a very general way. I also think that e.g. the issue of grammar translation when analyzing international teaching materials is irrelevant. A clearer and more

		straightforward research design would have strengthened the overall outcome of the thesis.
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	
5. The thesis shows critical and analytical thinking about the area of study and the author's expertise in this area.	Outstanding Very good 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 demonstrates high quality writing skills and uses standard spelling, grammar, and punctuation.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	
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 reference p. 14 where multiple authors are mentioned is problematic. Only the original works should be provided without Klečková's handout.

Final Comments & Questions

Ms. Kašpárková conducted a multifaceted examination of CLIL materials, especially their grammar teaching elements. She shows a lot of enthusiasm about the topic of her thesis. It is obvious that the author invested a lot of time and energy into the project (e.g. the number of references consulted, the scope of materials examined). The findings make the reader think about the examined subject matter and consider the role of grammar in CLIL classes. Even though the thesis bears some limitations as pointed out above, the work has, without any question, positively contributed to Ms. Kašpárková's understanding of the subject matter.

I would like the author to address these questions during the defense:

1. What was the actual and desired focus of your research? What did you want to learn?
2. Would you see any parallel between the content of the examined materials and the identified grammar focus in these materials?
3. Could you explain your statement that one can be understood without grammar that you provide on p. 61?

I suggest that the author is awarded the grade "very good" for her thesis project.

Reviewer: Mgr. Gabriela Klečková, Ph.D.

Date: June 4, 2021

Signature: