



Department of English and American Studies
Faculty of Arts, Palacký University

Křížkovského 10, 771 80 Olomouc, Czech Republic
telephone: +420 68-5633103, fax: +420 68-5633101,
<http://www.upol.cz/resources/English>

REVIEW of BA diploma thesis

Author of the work: Petra Kubičková

Title of the work: Impoliteness Strategies: A Case Study of the *South Park* Television Series

Supervisor: Mgr. Markéta Janebová, Ph.D.

Opponent: Mgr. Markéta Dančová

Author of this review: Mgr. Markéta Janebová, Ph.D.

=====

Points /results (for each section & proposed classification)

<i>excellent</i>	5	A
<i>very good</i>	4	B
<i>good</i>	3	C

<i>acceptable</i>	2	D
<i>weak/sufficient</i>	1	E
<i>insufficient</i>	0	F

	Points
1. <i>Originality and new contribution to the field, up-to-date presentation of the problem.</i> The thesis focuses on impoliteness strategies. In the thesis, the author was “assessing the applicability of Culpeper’s model to this type of discourse and for finding out whether it is robust enough”. This is more than one typically expects from a standard BA thesis	A
2. <i>Awareness of treatments in the field (literature).</i> Excellent. The author was able to provide a critical analysis of the sources by comparing two Culpeper’s models of impoliteness as well as other sources. The reference to Spencer-Oatey and her increasing influence is rather sketchy, but given the limited space of a BA thesis, it is not a major issue.	A
3. <i>Clarity of the topic, research question(s), hypotheses</i> The author compares the oldest and the most recent episodes of <i>South Park</i> as well as the applicability of the standard models of impoliteness.	A
4. <i>Methodology.</i> The data set is very large for a BA thesis (645 occurrences from 8 selected episodes). The author went through all the examples manually, which is always methodologically problematic. I would probably classify some examples differently, but that is also one of the points of the thesis. The major contribution is the critical aspect of the analysis: at times, Culpeper’s classification is far from clear or there are overlaps.	B
5. <i>Argumentation, discussion, interpretation of the results, summary.</i> As mentioned before, in the interpretation of the results, the author provided critical analysis of the sources.	A
6. <i>Formal aspects of the work: format, graphics, bibliography formatting.</i> Excellent	A
7. <i>English (language correctness, style)</i> Excellent	A
8. <i>For the supervisor (if not applicable, write " Not applicable ")</i> Exemplary	A

Summary: This is an excellent BA thesis. The author proved that she is able to work independently and think critically. In the thesis, the approaches regarded as classic and standard in the field are applied to data and examined critically.

Questions for the defence:

1. *Withhold politeness* was expected to be the last frequent strategy, which turned out to be the case. I wonder if there are good reasons to regard this strategy as an independent strategy at all (which is a question for Culpeper rather than the author of the thesis, but still.)
2. Banter (mock impoliteness) vs. “genuine” impoliteness. What are the means of distinguishing between them?

I recommend the work for the defence: YES

Proposed classification:¹ **A**

Date: 5.6.2022

Name (and signature): Mgr. Markéta Janebová, Ph.D.

¹ The itemized number evaluations above do **NOT** provide automatically the final evaluation - some weaknesses are more crucial than others and some cannot be compensated at all. The proposed classification is therefore independent on these statistics. It is the comprehensive evaluation of the presented written work and it can be still modified during the defence to become the result of the defence.