



Report on the part of the final state examination Record of the thesis defence

Academic year: 2022/2023

Student's name and surname: Teresa Fernández Arriola
Student's ID: 13596721

Type of the study programme: Master's (post-Bachelor)
Study programme: International Master in Security, Intelligence and Strategic Studies (IMSIS)

Study ID: 722484

Title of the thesis: Far-right parties youth social media targeting: An analysis of Vox's Instagram and TikTok Activity
Thesis department: Department of Security Studies (23-KBS)
Language of the thesis: English
Language of defence: English
Advisor: prof. Maura Conway
Date of defence: 21.09.2023 **Venue of defence:** Praha
Attempt: regular

Course of defence: The student wrote about how the far-right party Vox attracts young voters online. The student began by explaining the importance and timelines of the case, saying that she wanted to understand what helped the party rise so quickly - a research area, as the student explained, has been understudied, especially in relation to graphic content. The student then described the research questions that guided her research. In her theoretical framework, the student first theorized the concept of far-right and then focused on theories that study their successfulness and their strategies online. The student used visual content analysis, which she used across a time frame and across a range of social media platforms. She explained the process and variables she chose to operationalize her approach and how she in general conducted her analysis. The student then discussed her findings, demonstrating answers to all three parts of her question, describing strategies being used as well as differences between how it is done on different platforms. She also highlighted disinformation and memes as important tools. Following that, she explained how her findings aligned with existing theories on the topic. Moving on to the reviews, the student mentioned: 1) formal - tables might have helped with the argument, chapters might have been structured differently, concluding paragraphs might have been added - she agreed with these; she however did not agree with a) comment that the research lacked relevance - she directly disputed this, saying that her study was both relevant and done in a relevant way; or b) that she failed to explain the choice of her case study - to which the student mentioned that she had, further extending on how the issue was relevant. The student then also discussed the issues of possible bias, but mentioned that it was recommended to her that it was not to be a problem in the work. The committee asked if the student could reiterate the

relevance of her work - the student reiterated that it was about studying an understudied yet important phenomenon - the committee reflected on this, suggesting that the contribution was empirical, which is perfectly fine. The committee thanked the student and announced her successful completion of the defense.

Result of defence:	very good (C)	
Chair of the board:	prof. PhDr. Emil Aslan, Ph.D. (present)
Committee members:	Marcin Kaczmarski, Dr. (present)
	Sarah Leonard (present)