

Hodnocení návrh. opočetem bod. pr.: velmi dobře
Hodnocení navrhované vedoucím bakalářské práce: velmi dobře

Průběh obhajoby bakalářské práce:

Adéla Landovská started defending her thesis "A comparative analysis of the ways Divergent and The Hunger Games handle the coming-of-age narrative (Tris and Katniss)" by briefly presenting the aims which were (a) to compare the ways in which the two series analysed handle the coming-of-age narrative, (b) identify the aspects and events that turned them into heroines and (c) compare the similarities and differences of the two series.

When asked by Dr Vernyik what her claims were based on exactly (e.g. a psychoanalytical theory), the candidate answered somewhat hesitantly she took it from her thesis. When asked again, she added she found it in a book but could not remember its title. Dr Marková then summarised instead of the candidate that she understands the candidate took the theoretical book in question and based the whole chapter on it, to which the candidate agreed, specifying that, as the topic is transition to adulthood, the name of the book is similar to that of the chapter.

When presenting the conclusion of her thesis, the candidate stated that the similarities are better known because they are more visible than the differences and that her thesis proved that claim. She then went on to mention particular similarities, such as, e.g., a life-changing event, girls initially lacking confidence who later become both women and heroines, etc. She commented some of the six bullet points more in detail.

In order to save time, Dr Vernyik asked the candidate to rather summarize than read individual differences from the slide as the committee can read them on their own. Dr Klapcsik suggested "a conclusion of the conclusion".

Next the candidate showed the committee two slides with six "questions" from the thesis supervisor and the second reader. As the candidate commented on the first item, Dr Klapcsik noted that her answer (the heroes in general are born into post-apocalyptic society and it is not their fault, they try to survive in it, etc.) was also one to his own question (No. 6) about anthropocene. The candidate noted that yes, and that although the two movies show the bad state of the world, they also show a shift towards a better future. So the apocalypse is not an end, it is just a new beginning.

The candidate then went on to answer other questions, all of them somewhat unconvincingly, rather presenting something than answering the questions or comments. In case of Question 3, the discussion was happening rather among the members of the committee until Dr Marková stated that the reviewer is actually doing the candidate's job in the defence.

Dr Klapcsik made a note that students are always welcome to answer the criticism of the committee admitting their flaw(s). The candidate's "questions" in the presentation were a mixture of questions, remarks and suggestions, which the committee found confusing. Dr Marková closed a discussion with a minor, yet an important remark, asking the candidate to pronounce the name "Divergent" which she kept on pronouncing badly throughout her defence.

Dr Marková then opened the final grade discussion, stating that the candidate only presented, and did not actually defend her thesis. Dr Vernyik said the presentation was not good enough to make the grade any better. Dr Marková asked Dr Palatinus what the student was like when she wrote the thesis. Dr Palatinus answered she was very diligent, working hard, but unfortunately lacked the theoretical background and although he was trying to push her in the right direction, she was not always able to follow such advice. While Dr Palatinus thought the background was missing, Dr Klapcsik did think the theoretical part was strong. Dr Palatinus replied to this stating that the thesis was actually a very mechanical work, not very organically worked on. Dr Vernyik then remember that her performance in the state examination was actually similar to the way she presented ideas of her thesis in the defence.

When called in by the committee, the candidate was told she had passed but the committee had been rather unimpressed by her performance on many occasions. Dr Marková also noted that while the list of sources was very impressive in its volume, the candidate could not even remember the title of the book when asked by Dr Vernyik, which might make it look like somebody else's text. The candidate was given a suggestion to focus better on her future performance in exams.

Klasifikace:
velmi dobře

Datum obhajoby: 6. 9. 2022

.....
předseda zkušební komise