

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

Thesis Author: **Zuzana Klímová**

Title: *The gerund in an English sentence – theoretical description of its syntactic role in a sentence structure*

Length: 76 pages

Text Length: 53 pages

<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Scale</b>	<b>Comments</b>
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 <b>Very good</b> Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	
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).	<b>Outstanding</b> Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	
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.	<b>Outstanding</b> Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	<b>Outstanding</b> 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 <b>Very good</b> 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 uses standard spelling, grammar, and punctuation.	Outstanding Very good <b>Acceptable</b> 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 <b>Very good</b> Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	
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 <b>Acceptable</b> Somewhat deficient Very deficient	

## Final Comments & Questions

There is a somewhat curious beginning to this work: five lines into section 1.1, subsection 1.1.1 entitled ING-FORM – GERUND, PARTICIPLE, ADJECTIVE, VERBAL NOUN, the author suddenly produces pulls “deverbal noun” out of the hat, even preceding it with a definite article to boot, as if this were a term with which every reader should be familiar in advance. In what follows it becomes apparent that, while the form is frequently the same at surface level, the difference is primarily one of aspect: gerunds refer to processes, whereas deverbal nouns indicate the result(s) of these processes. The practical benefits accruing from this nuanced distinction are not immediately apparent, which is perhaps why some grammarians see no need to use the term “deverbal noun” at all. At the other extreme, adding “abstract deverbal nouns” (p. 6) to the mix seems only to make confusion worse confounded, for even abstract paintings represent tangible objects, as do concrete buildings.

The author valiantly attempts to guide the reader through this morass of frequently overlapping categories and sometimes seemingly arbitrary terminology. The subject matter has been well researched and chosen literary excerpts diligently selected and analysed. From a formal perspective the work is logically organised and neatly presented. Unfortunately, however, it is somewhat marred by numerous spelling errors: *aslo* (as opposed to “also”) appears on no fewer than nine occasions, two of which involve quoted texts: firstly on p. 22 of the main text, then in ex. 6 in the Adjectival Complememnt (*sic*) section of the Appendix. Further discrepancies in quoted material occur in the following:

(HJ-S/12) Yes, htey fought the minute they found themselves together, but fighting was na expression of love, wasn't it? (p. 23)

(JBSD-Cadj/3) It was a joke, the wearily ironic response of a writer fed up with being pesterd for th ereal identity of his most famous creation. (p. 28)

(HJ-post/12) The fact of his never smiling was the irrefagable proof of that. (p. 32)

(JBSE-Oprep/6) Or you can just let it go – forget about remembering – and then sometimes you find that the mislaid fact surfaces on ahour or a day later. (p. 40)

(IM-Oprep/5) Some lean fitness in early old age that seemed derived less from healthy living htan from a hunger to keep on creating. (p. 40)

(JBSE-Adv/7) Not about how she might hae felt on first reding the letter. (p.48)

(HJ-Adv/4) Could she have been jealous of Gratan for enjoying a protection she ahd come to see as hers alone? (p.49)

Errors in the author's own words include the following: *There are no clear sighs of the words being either a verb or a noun* (p. 6); *Not using a possessive case is according to Dušková rafter incorrect* (p. 15); *keybord* (twice on p. 16); *sufficient nubmer of individual excerpts* and *The number of excerpts for furhter analysis was 380* (both on p. 18). The use of Czech style quotation marks throughout the text is another unwelcome distraction.

Overall, however, given the amount of effort the author has clearly put into researching, organising and presenting her material, it would be inappropriate to focus excessively on a few typos and quotation marks. The main reason for pointing them out at all is to justify the two ratings of ‘Acceptable’ in the rubric overleaf.

Recommended grade: **v ý b o r n ě**

Reviewer: Andrew Tollet

Date: 28th August 2020

Signature: