

**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: Králiková Zuzana

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

**Reviewer:**

Surname and given name: Miessler Jan

Affiliation: KMS IKSŽ FSV UK

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Methodology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	Thesis structure	<input checked="" 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 thesis itself does not include the original research proposal. In fact, the approved proposal is mostly in line with the submitted thesis as it presents the same research focus (Slovak “post-girlboss memes”), method (visual grounded theory) and structure.

**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	A
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	C
2.6	Thesis originality and its contribution to academic knowledge production	B

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

The thesis focuses on what seems to be a very niche topic but one that provides an opportunity for penetrating and innovative analysis. The innovative approach is certainly present. However, its presentation could have been more convincing, and some problems should have been avoided.

The theoretical part presents three theoretical concepts from the domain of critical / postmodern theory, but it does not really explain the choice of Mouffe, Bakhtin and Gramsci over other possibly relevant authors, and the use of their theories. Visual grounded theory is very well explained, but it could be more clearly linked to the research questions. These gaps are confusing and although the thesis is written in a clear language and there are many helpful examples and explanations, the reader is sometimes kept wondering about the real focus of the thesis.

The analysis of the 90 selected memes presents their various aspects but usually does not provide examples or illustrations. The author could explain more clearly where is the post-girlboss and how the author identified

the key aspects of the memes etc. The conclusion is rather short, and the theoretical relevance of the analysis is merely suggested.

### 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)	D
3.5	Conformity to quotation standards (*)	B
3.6	Use of an academic writing style, and correct use of language (both grammar and spelling)	A
3.6	Quality of the textual lay-outing and appendices	C

(\*) 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):

The thesis lacks page numbers both at the bottom of each page and usually also in references. Webpages cannot be referenced by a simple link. The appendix only contains the list of memes with links, it would be better to also include the actual memes as the links can get broken.

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

The thesis is innovative in its research topic and theoretical apparatus, the execution of the analysis and a few formal issues are aspects that could have been improved.

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

5.1	
5.2	
5.3	
5.4	

### 6. ANTIPLAGIARISM CHECK

The reviewer is familiar with the thesis' URKUND score.

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

6.1	The parts highlighted by the system are in fact properly referenced.
-----	--

### 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: June 17, 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.*