La Sapienza

Revisione esterna tesi dott. SOPHIE EYSSETTE (37 ciclo)

EYSSETTE SOPHIE CAROLINE

Evaluation form for PhD dissertation

Evaluation form

Title of the thesis

Taboo Language and Incest in the French and British press (2017-2022), a cross-linguistic corpus-assisted discourse analysis

Affiliation of the reviewer

University of Wroclaw

Report

The thesis by Sophie Eyssette is a comprehensive and transdisciplinary study of the language that relates to the incest taboo, particularly its representation in the French and British press between 2017 and 2022. However, focusing on press coverage cannot entirely grasp public perceptions or taboos about incest, as press reports are often shaped by specific editorial policies and public opinion. Thus, the results presented by Sophie Eyssette need to be constrained to reflect media construals rather than general public opinion. All things considered, both theoretical and practical objectives are well interlinked, providing a solid interdisciplinary contribution to linguistics and sociocultural studies.

The Author makes an insightful argument about the linguistic framing of incest in the French and British press. Beyond its academic contribution, this thesis has profound social implications and encourages us to reflect on how language shapes our collective understanding of power and violence. The thesis is well-written. Specific suggestions on grammar and style have been made using the track-changes function. In addition, a few comments have been placed directly into the text. These should be understood as areas for further research rather than as necessary shortcomings to be corrected at this stage of the PhD process. In conclusion, I hold a definitely positive assessment of the thesis and am confident that it merits progression to the subsequent stages of the PhD award process.

Confidential report (it will not be shown to the candidate)

Evaluation file (optional)

Presentation and clarity

[ ] None   [ ] Poor   [ ] Average   [X] Good   [ ] Excellent

The reviewer should be able to read the text without difficulty. This implies that the dissertation is clear and 'user friendly', without duplications or repetitions.

Integration and coherence

[ ] None   [ ] Poor   [ ] Average   [X] Good   [ ] Excellent

The manuscript should present logical and rational links between different parts of the thesis.

Introduction to scientific background

[ ] None   [ ] Poor   [ ] Average   [X] Good   [ ] Excellent

The text should contain a satisfactory introduction to the scientific background which is relevant to the research, preparing the reader to the exposition of the problem.

Review of relevant literature

[ ] None   [ ] Poor   [ ] Average   [X] Good   [ ] Excellent

The candidate must have a detailed knowledge of original sources, have a thorough knowledge of the field, and understand the main theoretical and methodological issues.

Statement of research problem

[ ] None   [ ] Poor   [ ] Average   [X] Good   [ ] Excellent

A clear statement of the research problem should be made, together with specific hypotheses, predictions, or questions which the research is designed to address.

Originality

[ ] None   [ ] Poor   [ ] Average   [ ] Good   [X] Excellent

The research must be the candidate's own work. The degree of independence may vary according to the research topic.

Contribution to knowledge and scientific relevance

[ ] None   [ ] Poor   [ ] Average   [X] Good   [ ] Excellent

The dissertation should be substantial enough to be able to form the basis of two articles on refereed journal, a book or research monograph.

Mastery of the English language

[ ] None   [ ] Poor   [ ] Average   [X] Good   [ ] Excellent

The candidate must be proficient in written English and show mastery of appropriate scientific/technical language.

The thesis can be considered for a 'cum laude' award

[ ] Yes   [X] No

A major goal of the review process is to evaluate if the present version of the thesis is:

1) adequate as is

2) require minor revision

3) require major revision

for admission of the candidate to the defense of the work in front of a national evaluation board.

[ ] Accept as is   [X] Minor revision   [ ] Major revision

Date: 12/10/2024
Reviewer: Kuzniak Marek