

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

Thesis Author: Ivona Jelínková

Title: THE COMPETITION OF MODAL AUXILIARY *CAN/COULD* AND ITS
 PERIPRASTIC FORM *TO BE ABLE TO*

Length: 47

Text Length: 30

<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 Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see final comments down the page
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	see final comments down the page
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	see final comments down the page
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see final comments down the page
5. Conclusion effectively restates the argument. It summarizes the main findings and follows logically from the analysis presented.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient	see final comments down the page

	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 Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	see final comments down the page
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	see final comments down the page
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	see final comments down the page

Final Comments & Questions

This undergraduate thesis deals with the grammar of the English language, focusing on the meaning and occurrence of the modal verb *can* (*could*) and its periphrastic form *be able to*...

The author undoubtedly tried very hard, nevertheless, the result of her effort is quite poor. From the overall low quality, it is the Theoretical Part which deserves to be praised since it is worked out well. Here, the author focuses on such areas of the grammar of verbs that are relevant from the point of view of modal auxiliaries, and provides a well organized and definitely sufficient base for the following analytical part.

In spite of the well prepared theoretical base, the practical part – the analysis shows a lot of shortcomings, among them mainly verbosity, long-windedness, inability to focus on the main points and vagueness. It takes great pains to get to the point, i.e. to find the results of the analysis and following conclusions drawn from the results.

The language of the work shows the author's awkwardness in building sentences; she has problems with the word order (the principles of FSP does not accept the rules of the English grammatical word order, e.g. pp 22, 25), as well as with using vocabulary (e.g. p 23 - "...it is resulted from the fact ...") whenever she is supposed to formulate longer syntactic units by herself (i.e. without a support of the academic text). Misspelled words should not occur in such a piece of academic writing (e.g. 5 *CATHEGORIES*).

As a whole this work is of a rather low quality, just on the brim of passing; it will be a challenge for the author to present it during the defence.

Supervisor/Reviewer: PhDr. Jarmila Petrlíková, Ph.D. (supervisor)

Date: July 1 2014

Signature:

