



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Eliška Djokíćová

Title: At a Loss for Words: Capturing the Duality of Political Correctness (PC)

Programme/year: MV/2024

Author of Evaluation (second reader): Kristián Földes

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	10	8
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	30	22
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	30
<i>Total</i>		80	60
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	7
	Style	5	5
	Formal requirements	5	4
<i>Total</i>		20	16
TOTAL		100	76



Evaluation

Major criteria:

The author proposes an intriguing topic for her thesis research. The study of Political Correctness (PC) and its social, cultural, and, particularly, political implications is an important component of current social science research worldwide. The controversies surrounding the concept of PC caused societal division and significant changes in the political landscape of many countries around the world, particularly those that can be collectively referred to as the West.

Regarding the positive comments, I must point out that the first two chapters (Introduction/Literature review) are extremely well written, and I thoroughly enjoyed reading them. I believe the author put a lot of effort into understanding the history of Political Correctness (PC) as a concept, and for this section, I would give the thesis 100 points. Unfortunately, the following sections were not as well received.

One of my major concerns about the theoretical and conceptual anchoring of the research is the frequency of use and the overemphasis on Alexander Wendt's social constructivist approach. I am aware that Wendt is unquestionably the most influential IR scholar in the field of constructivism. However, he is not alone. In this regard, I am afraid the author made a similar mistake that I have made several times before: her theoretical framework relies too heavily on Wendt while ignoring other influential pathways within and outside of IR constructivist scholarship. In this regard, I must also point out that Wendt's approach is systemic, so applying the conceptual apparatus of his specific constructivist approach may not be particularly appropriate for the purposes of the author's thesis. In this case, the author should have included other scholarly works that focus on individual or group identities (Mead, Blumer, Goffman, Tajfel, Turner, Hogg, etc.) as well as socio-cognitive approaches that take into account the social construction of our reality (mental



**FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
Charles University

models, context models, group knowledge). The author mentions psychology as one of the fields she draws on, but the thesis in my opinion omits this scholarship, which studies the social aspects of cognition. Also, the author mentions an emphasis on the linguistic understanding of PC, but I did not see any references to either the semantic or pragmatic assessment of the concept, and the author herself does not show any theoretical or conceptual inspiration from linguistics or discourse studies.

In terms of the empirical part, I am unable to provide much of an assessment of the author's analytical skills and results presentation because I am not qualified in quantitative methodologies. As a result, I would delegate complete responsibility for this aspect of the assessment to the supervisor. What strikes me is that, even if I do not specialize in quantitative methodologies, the presentation of the results should provide a clear interpretation of the data and its relevance to the field, which I did not find in this thesis. Aside from the presentation of several measurement tools and their quantified representations, I could not find anything about data interpretation in either the results section or the conclusion. It is worth noting that if the empirical part's only outcome was the testing of quantitative tools designed to analyze the concept of PC, the thesis fails to consider the social science implications. This programme is part of the Faculty of Social Sciences. As a result, the research of our students should make valuable contributions to the field while keeping the term "social" in mind. As a result, in order to clarify the ambiguities raised by the conclusion, I'd like to ask the author a series of simple questions, which should be answered during the defense.

Kindly respond to these questions/comments in simple sentences, as if you were presenting them to someone who is not familiar with the complexities of quantitative research methods and descriptive statistics, such as policymakers.

1. Identify and explain the three main contributions of the empirical analysis.



**FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
Charles University

2. How did the analysis's findings contribute to a better understanding of the concept of Political Correctness and its various normative and behavioral dimensions?
3. How did the thesis contribute to our understanding of Political Correctness in light of the authors' well-developed literature review in Chapter 2? What gaps did the study fill?

Minor criteria:

In terms of minor criteria, the thesis is well-written, with the exception of some stylistic flaws [highlighted text in the appendices]. I am aware that the author uploaded a second version of her thesis after the deadline, which does not contain some of these deficiencies, but per the advice of the Faculty's IT department and standard procedures, I was required to evaluate the original version of the thesis.

Assessment of plagiarism:

The similarity protocol revealed no significant evidence of plagiarism (8%), whereas the Turnitin check revealed 30% similarity. This should be noted during the defense, and the author should comment on it.

Overall evaluation:

Overall, I would recommend defending the thesis with a C.

Suggested grade: C

Signature: