



POSUDEK OPONENTA BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

Studijní obor: **Anglický jazyk a literatura (dvouoborové studium)**

Název práce: **A Sociolinguistic Study of the New York City English and its Lexis**

Autorka práce: **Karolína Dvořáková**

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Helena Lohrová, Ph.D.**

Oponent bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Petr Kos, Ph.D.**

Short characteristics of the thesis

The thesis examines the specific vocabulary of the dialect used on the territory of the New York City. According to the abstract of the thesis, its goal is to investigate to what extent the specific lexis is still in current use in New York and to what extent the lexis has spread beyond the city. The author selected four specific groups of vocabulary, namely Yiddishisms, Italianisms, other words of foreign origin, and words which were coined in New York. A selected sample of such terms comprised a questionnaire, which was distributed among three groups of respondents, viz. New Yorkers, Americans living in other parts of the US, and English speakers living in other English-speaking countries. The collected data were subject to further analysis.

Overall assessment

The author has selected an interesting topic, which goes beyond the traditional topics of Bachelor's theses. What should be appreciated is that the author attempted to collect real-life data from respondents abroad and, in this way, to map to what extent certain expressions are still in current use.

The thesis is clearly structured and is written in generally good English, with some minor lapses only, usually connected to the use of commas and the level of formality, such as the use of contracted forms or the use of words for which more formal synonyms would be more adequate (e.g., the use of the adjective *big* in *the biggest influence* (p. 15), *the next big immigration wave* (p. 16), *the big number of German immigrants* (p. 20), etc.).

Further I will focus on some major deficiencies of the work only.

Firstly, the author does not provide any explanation on what grounds she selected the specific lexical items within the four categories. I believe that the selection can significantly influence the results and it should be carried out with some intention. Some words can be expected to be used more frequently than others (we could expect that we talk more frequently about food than slovenly people), but the semantic field to which the word belongs to was not taken into consideration.

More importantly, the author should have presented the results of the analysis more clearly and focus more on highlighting the tendencies that result from the collected data and on their possible interpretation. For each category, the author mostly merely states the frequencies in the tables and then describes these at length in the paragraphs below. Not only is this difficult to follow for the reader (perhaps some other graphic presentation of the results would be more suitable), but also, and this is my major



reservation, the major outcome of the thesis, the critical interpretation of the tendencies, remains somewhat hidden. Also, some of the claims are not supported by data. For instance, for the claim that “younger New Yorkers were usually not familiar with them [words and expressions], while older inhabitants of New York were more likely to know and use these terms” (p. 76) we cannot find any support in the text. The same appears to be true for “the results of my research showed that these factors [age, gender, ethnicity, etc.] play a significant role when it comes to the usage of the NYCE lexicon” (p. 78), as, for instance, gender, apart from a description of gender stratification of the respondents at pp. 27-31, does not seem to be taken into account in the analysis itself.

However, despite the comments above, the thesis meets the requirements for a successful Bachelor’s thesis.

Práci doporučuji k obhajobě.

Navrhovaná klasifikace: **velmi dobře**

30 May 2022

Datum

Podpis