Undergraduate Thesis Assessment Rubric (Linguistics)

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

---

Thesis Author: **Petr Neuman**

Title: **The Competition of the Gerundial and Infinitive Clauses in the Function of Subject of an English Sentence.**

Length: 48

Text Length: 44

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	Introduction describes the structure of the thesis. However, the choice of the topic of the thesis is explained merely by the author's interest in the topic. There is no mention of the importance of the topic from the linguistic point of view.
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 thesis shows the author's extensive knowledge of the subject matter as well as his interest in the topic of the thesis. Various relevant sources were used by the author.
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	In the theoretical part of the thesis the author describes ways of realization of the subject in an English sentence by infinitive and gerund. The ideas are supported with numerous examples and appropriate explanations.
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Outstanding **Very good** Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	
5. Conclusion effectively restates the argument. It summarizes the main findings and follows logically from the analysis presented.	**Outstanding** Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	Conclusion is well written and summarizes the main findings of the research.
6. The text is organized in a logical manner. It flows naturally and is easy to follow. Transitions, summaries and	Outstanding **Very good** Acceptable	

	conclusions exist as appropriate. The author uses standard spelling, grammar, and punctuation.	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 **Very good** Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	The language is appropriate in style but many slips and typing errors can be found in the text.
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 structure of the practical part does not meet the requirements. Excerpts from literary texts (pp. 13 - 41) should have been presented in a separate attachment at the end of the thesis. The results of the analysis (pp. 41-42) are deficient and should have been presented in a more detailed way.

Final Comments & Questions

The author shows excellent knowledge of the subject matter as well as his interest in the topic of the thesis. The author describes various ways of realization of the subject in an English sentence by infinitive and gerund.

The language of the thesis is not always accurate. The text is full of slips and typing errors, e.g. "The subject realized by infinitive express's an evaluation" (p.4); "it is one of common form" (p.5), "...it is more then hard" (p.7), etc.

The worst shortcoming of the thesis is the structure of the practical part. Part 3.3. Results of the Analysis is deficient and should have been presented in a more detailed way.

Taking into consideration the comments stated above, the evaluation recommended is "very good".

Reviewer: Anna Šteflová

Date: 15.8.2012

Signature: