

La Sapienza

Revisione esterna tesi dott. GIOVANNI RAFFA

RAFFA GIOVANNI

godność 2.0ry
Wydział Humanistyczny
Starszy specjalista
w Biurze Ewaluacji i Obsługi Instytutów
mgr Karolina Koneczna-Montał

UNIwersytet Śląski
W KATOWICACH
Wydział Humanistyczny
41-200 Sosnowiec
gen. Stefana Grot-Roweckiego 5

Evaluation form for PhD dissertation

Evaluation form

Title of the thesis

Italian subtitling solutions for English-language stand-up comedy

Affiliation of the reviewer

Universidad de Buenos Aires

Report

After reading the candidate's dissertation, I consider Mr. Raffa can take his viva after some minor corrections to his thesis. The text is well-organized, the research questions are answered throughout the dissertation, the paths to pursue for future research are interesting, and the bibliography is extensive and relevant. However, there are some minor issues that need to be fixed. A re-reading of the whole text is needed to solve some problems like missing words ("are reflected the context", for example) or missing quotes (page 54), capitalization of words (the same word is sometimes written with a capital first letter and other times it is not, cf. Priorities and Restrictions on page 125 and others, for instance), different font sizes (pages 80, 81, 83), confusing words (like "amatorial" as opposed to "professional"), and some sentence order / grammar issues (such as "different is the case of" or "what has initially being"). Also, note 9 is already included in the text. Finally, there is no clear explanation as to why "the performances for this dissertation have been selected by prioritising British standup performers who have been translated on popular catalogues

(e.g.: Netflix, Prime Video), and eventually included (albeit limitedly) a highly successful Australian performer (Hannah Gadsby) and limited examples of American stand-up comedy.” If the thesis is about English language stand-up comedy, then the reason for limiting the corpus to those performances should be explained in more detail. (There is an explanation of why the candidate chose Netflix over Prime Video, though.)

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

Evaluation file (optional)

Presentation and clarity

None Poor Average 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 Good Excellent

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

Introduction to scientific background

None Poor Average 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 Minor revision Major revision

Date: 7/10/2024

Reviewer: Scandura Gabriela