

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

**Thesis Author: Petr Kment**

**Title: ENGLISH SUPPLEMENTIVE CLAUSES AND THEIR CZECH EQUIVALENTS**

**Length: 58**

**Text Length: 31**

| <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 ◀<br>Very good<br>Acceptable<br>Somewhat deficient<br>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 ◀<br>Very good<br>Acceptable<br>Somewhat deficient<br>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<br>Very good<br>Acceptable ◀<br>Somewhat deficient<br>Very deficient | see final comments down the page |
| 4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.  | Outstanding ◀<br>Very good<br>Acceptable<br>Somewhat deficient<br>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<br>Very good<br>Acceptable ◀<br>Somewhat deficient<br>Very deficient | see final comments down the page |
| 6. The text is organized in a logical manner. It flows naturally and is  | Outstanding ◀<br>Very good   | see final comments down the page |

|   |  |                                  |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| easy to follow. Transitions, summaries and conclusions exist as appropriate. The author uses standard spelling, grammar, and punctuation.   | Acceptable<br>Somewhat deficient<br>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<br>Very good ◀<br>Acceptable<br>Somewhat deficient<br>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<br>Very good ◀<br>Acceptable<br>Somewhat deficient<br>Very deficient | see final comments down the page |

## Final Comments & Questions

### Final Comments & Questions

The above assessed undergraduate thesis deals with a wonderful topic within the area of grammar – syntax of a sentence: the supplementive clauses. Czech equivalents of structures of this kind is also included within it, namely the issue of Czech transgressives, which seem to be one of the most suitable ways of translating English non-finite supplementive clauses. Nevertheless the problem is that this means of expression is on the edge of the usage in the Czech language and that is why there are other ways of translation that have to be taken into account.

The Introduction presents the issue and describes the way in which the whole work (theory, analysis, conclusions) is organized.

In order to provide an appropriate theoretical basis necessary for the following analysis, the author of the thesis has chosen the descriptions of the above mentioned structures by multiple recognized linguists found in academic grammar books (it is a shame that the author has not included any monographs dealing with either this or related topic, and the only shorter piece of work – the article dealing with a related topic by J. Petříková is mentioned without its title). Nevertheless the theoretical description which the author has provided is sufficient. Since the viewpoints of individual linguists rather differ; the ways of distinction, delimitation and classification of the structures are quite difficult to follow. However, the author of this thesis has proved his ability to study, understand and order the theoretical stuff. He has (probably) chosen Quirk et al's viewpoint but unfortunately, I miss his reasoning for having chosen this particular standpoint.

The Practical Part contains the description of the method of the analysis of individual supplementive clauses and the results of the analysis.

The analysis itself is focused on the frequency of the supplementive clauses, the structure of the clauses, their position within a sentence (including the speculation about the potential change of its position) and their semantic meaning. The results of the analysis follow, accompanied by a number of clear graphs which enable the reader to get instant and clear information. What I consider a problem is the actual analysis (in the appendix). In my opinion the author should have provided a clearer process of the actual analysis. The number of abbreviations make it too difficult to follow. The criteria should have been organized hierarchically with respect to its position in the superordinate clause and then according to its internal structure. Then, there is a problem of using too complex expressions such as “*an overt subject present in the superordinate clause*”, “*an overt subject omitted*”. The former is irrelevant from the point of view of the internal structure of the supplementive clause. What should have been mentioned is whether the occurrence of the subject within the supplementive clause, since

this is then a criterion for their further classification (there is always an overt subject in a superordinate clause). The author should have used the term “covert subject” for structures with an implied subject identical with the subject of the superordinate clause. This inaccurate terminology leads then in a wrong classification in Conclusions, in which the two first classes distinguished as “1. *Suplementive clauses with an overt subject in the superordinate clause*” and “2. *Suplementive clauses with an overt subject omitted*”, should have been consider one – at least the examples, since in both suplementive clauses the subjects are covert and are co-referential with the subject of their superordinate clauses, the subject as the Agent in the former, and the subject as the Patient in the latter one (these problems could have hardly been prevented since I did not have an opportunity to point at them). The other classes which the author of the thesis distinguishes are relevant are proved by suitable examples. I also miss at least a short commentary on the way of translating the structures into Czech, with respect of using transgressives or other means of expression.

There is one thing which I highly appropriate in this chapter. This is the summary of the various attitudes of individual authors and the conclusions drawn from it (p. 30, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph).

The language of the thesis is at a very good level, some shortcomings, such as the omission of the subordinate conjunction, appear.

Despite the above mentioned problems I consider the work an acceptable piece of academic writing.

The suggested evaluation: 3 “dobře”

**Supervisor:** PhDr. Jarmila Petrlíková, Ph.D.

**Date:** August 10 2020

**Signature:**