

**CHARLES UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculty of Social Sciences**  
**Institute of Communication Studies and Journalism**

**MA THESIS REVIEW**

**NOTE: Only the grey fields should be filled out!**

**Review type** (choose one):

Review by thesis supervisor       Review by opponent

**Thesis author:**

Surname and given name: Králíková Zuzana

**Thesis title:** Post-girlboss memes as a form of subversive communication within the Slovak political context

**Reviewer:**

Surname and given name: Jan Jirák

Affiliation: KMS IKSŽ

**1. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESEARCH PROPOSAL AND THESIS** (mark one box for each row)

		Conforms to approved research proposal	Changes are well explained and appropriate	Changes are explained but are inappropriate	Changes are not explained and are inappropriate	Does not conform to approved research proposal
1.1	Research objective(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Methodology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	Thesis structure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTARY (description of the relationship between the research proposal and the thesis. If there are problems, please be specific):

The research proposal of the submitted thesis is not available in the thesis, therefore it is difficult to assess these parameters. However, it seems to me that the thesis has been produced according to a preconceived and thought-out approach.

**2. EVALUATION OF THE THESIS CONTENT**

Use letters A – B – C – D – E – F (A=best, F= failed)

		Grade
2.1	Quality and appropriateness of the theoretical framework	B
2.2	Ability to critically evaluate and apply the literature	B
2.3	Quality and soundness of the empirical research	B
2.4	Ability to select the appropriate methods and to use them correctly	A
2.5	Quality of the conclusion	A
2.6	Thesis originality and its contribution to academic knowledge production	A

COMMENTARY (description of thesis content and the main problems):

**3. EVALUATION OF THE THESIS FORM**

Use letters A – B – C – D – E – F (A=best, F= failed)

		Grade
3.1	Quality of the structure	B
3.2	Quality of the argumentation	B
3.3	Appropriate use of academic terminology	A
3.4	Quality, quantity and appropriateness of the citations (both in the theory part and in the empirical part)	A
3.5	Conformity to quotation standards (*)	A
3.6	Use of an academic writing style, and correct use of language (both grammar and spelling)	B
3.6	Quality of the textual lay-outing and appendices	B

(\*) in case the text contains quotations without references, the grade is F; in case the text contains plagiarised parts, do not recommend the thesis for defence and suggest disciplinary action against the author instead.

COMMENTARY (description of thesis form and the main problems):

**4. OVERAL EVALUATION** (provide a summarizing list of the thesis's strengths and weaknesses):

The thesis aims to seek answers to questions concerning a selected aspect of political participation in the Slovak environment and the subversive potential of selected memes, which she calls post-girl boss (already in the introduction the author formulates the questions "Are post-girlboss memes truly subversive? What are the implications of these memes on the political make-up of Slovakia, especially on Slovak youth?"). This - rather broad and ambitious - intention hides one problem of the whole concept: from the point of view of disciplinary grounding, these are actually two quite different topics: on the one hand, the subversive potential (directed towards the content of memes), on the other hand, the relationship to political communion and participation. The chapter 1 on theoretical approach reveals that the author is trying to follow both directions of thinking which causes some confusion in the outline of theoretical framework.

The thesis is structured into four broader parts (theoretical framework, contextual links, methodology and the research itself) framed by an introduction and a conclusion. The chapters are further divided into sub-chapters and the result is quite clear and logical. Orientation in the text is hampered by the fact that the exceedingly brief Table of Contents does not include chapter or subchapter numbers. The analysis itself is carefully done and offers a number of interesting insights, but it tends to be descriptive in a way that moves slightly away from the principles stated in the methodology chapter.

The quality of the text is reduced by superficial proofreading, which is reflected in some uncorrected deficiencies (e.g. confusion between VGTM and VTGM, see chapter 3.4).

However, I believe that the thesis proves that the author has mastered the basic principles of professional work and the principles of academic writing. The thesis is based on a solidly conducted literature search, relies on a well laid out and discussed methodology, and offers defensible data from the research itself. I therefore recommend the submitted thesis for defence.

**5. QUESTIONS OR TOPICS TO BE DISCUSSED DURING THE THESIS DEFENSE:**

5.1	
5.2	
5.3	
5.4	

**6. ANTIPLAGIARISM CHECK**

X The reviewer is familiar with the thesis' URKUND score.

If the score is above 5%, please evaluate and indicate problems:

6.1	
-----	--

**6. SUGGESTED GRADE OF THE THESIS AS A WHOLE** (choose one or two)

- A  excellent
- B  very good (above average but with some weaknesses)
- C  good (average with some important weaknesses)
- D  satisfactory (below average with significant weaknesses)
- E  marginal pass (meeting minimal requirements)
- F  not recommended for defence

If the mark is an "F", please provide your reasons for not recommending the thesis for defence:

--

Date: May 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2024

Signature: .....

***A finalised review should be printed, signed and submitted in two copies to the secretary of the Department of Media Studies. The electronic version of the review should be converted into a PDF and uploaded to SIS, or sent to the Department of Media Studies secretary who will upload it to SIS on the reviewer's behalf.***

***Do not upload PDFs with a scanned signature, the review uploaded to SIS must be without signature.***