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

Thesis Author: **DOMINIK FOJTA**

Title: THE ENGLISH PAST PERFECT AND ITS EQUIVALENTS

Length: 114

Text Length: 39

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	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 Very deficient	see final comments down the page
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

As the author suggests in the introductory part, this topic reflects the frequent confusion of students when they are exposed to a number of combinations of tenses and aspects in English. From this point of view, I find the choice really useful.

The theoretical part is systematic and seems neat; the author successfully works with the sources, combining direct citations and paraphrases. However, I only have several comments. In the subchapter about verbal dynamism I would appreciate a little more concrete information. Generally, several initial sub-chapters would be more complete if the author added illustrative examples to each theoretically described phenomenon. When speaking about the difference of the Czech and English verb categories, I think that the author should possible have listed the Czech ones too for the reader to see the concrete difference. On p. 7, the information about the different uses in BrE and AmE would deserve a separate subchapter. The explanatory sentence *In this example we can see that Jane's opinion will be already changed by the time they meet*, the author is not actually precise regarding the verb *hope* in the exemplifying sentence. As for the form of the examples, I would prefer their consistent formatting -while some examples are introduced in italics, others are not.

Furthermore in the chapter, the author compares individual verbal categories in Czech and English, which is a good development from individual descriptions to mutual relations. The final part about translation of these verbal forms appears a good final theoretical point.

The research part is introduced by description of the methods and the source of the research. The information seems to be complete enough to understand the results.

The results of the research are presented in a well-organized manner, showing clearly the usage of forms investigated. The material has been examined from a number points of view and the graphs bring a clear vision of the results. I appreciate the survey of examples, however the first one on page 27 is not very fortunate, in my opinion, as it is presented as an example of present perfect while it is actually modal plus perfect infinitive. A more transparent example would be more appropriate.

The conclusion successfully frames the work presenting clearly the answers to the research questions.

As for the style and language correctness, there are occasional grammatical mistakes (e.g. p. 5, second paragraph); p. 9: *two information*. What I consider a significant and rather disturbing element of the author's personal style is an enormous overuse of the word *nevertheless* and the phrase *although this may be true...*;

In conclusion, the thesis is a fairly good piece of work, with a visibly good attitude, however from the stylistic point of view, it has some weaker points which should be taken into consideration by the author, when writing another academic text.

Suggested evaluation: very good (velmi dobře).

Opponent: PhDr. Naděžda Stašková, Ph.D.

Date: June 4th 2021

Signature: