THESIS REVIEWER´S OPINION							
Student's full name	Hana Bernatíková						
Thesis title	Doublespeak in the Marketing of Coca-Cola						
Reviewer's name	Jeffrey Keith Parrott						
Degree course	English for Business Administration						
Mode of study	Full-time						
Thesis evaluation criteria	**Classification grade according to ECTS**						
Structure							
Outline and division		A	**B**	C	D	E	F
Language level		A	**B**	C	D	E	F
Formatting (citations, presentation)		A	**B**	C	D	E	F
Content							
Thesis statement formulation		A	B	**C**	D	E	F
Sources and their utilization		A	B	C	**D**	E	F
Methods of processing the research problem		A	**B**	C	D	E	F
Level of analytical and interpretive components		A	B	**C**	D	E	F
Formulation of conclusions and meeting the objectives		A	B	**C**	D	E	F
Originality and vocational contribution		A	**B**	C	D	E	F

Evaluation justification (strengths and weaknesses of thesis):

This thesis looks at whether Coca Cola uses "Doublespeak" in their social media marketing campaigns by analysing a selection of the company's posts on Facebook, Instagram, and X (formerly Twitter). The structure of the thesis follows straightforwardly. The first half contains a chapter on the concept of Doublespeak, first imagined as "Newspeak" by George Orwell, and later elaborated by Lutz and others as a framework for characterizing the manipulative use of language, as well as a chapter on marketing. The second half of the thesis contains a chapter on the history of the Coca-Cola company and an overview of its marketing strategies, along with a chapter that presents all of the social media posts examined, each accompanied by a brief analysis in terms of key words and categories related to Doublespeak and marketing. The thesis concludes with the observation that Coke uses little Doublespeak in its social media marketing, apparently preferring emotional appeals.

The thesis is certainly acceptable at this level and has multiple strengths: the research question, connecting a literary concept with social media marketing, is original; the qualitative analytical method applied to a selected corpus was well implemented; and the formal organization, English academic style, and overall formatting are generally good.

However, some weaknesses must be pointed out. There are minor issues with the style and formatting. For example, in the body text, the full names and titles of cited authors, along with the full titles of their articles and books, are repeated unnecessarily, because the required reference information is of course also given in a footnote on the same page, and once again in the bibliography. Most of the sources cited are appropriate, but the thesis would have been improved if some scepticism were employed and a greater diversity of views were thus consulted. For example, the sections on Newspeak and Doublespeak make extremely strong and general assertions about language and thought (e.g. p13 "language can corrupt thought") but cite only Orwell and Lutz, et al. without further consideration of such complex and disputed claims; moreover, the section on the history of Coca Cola cites only the company's own publications!

Although the thesis is well organized overall, the chapters seem conceptually disconnected. The

crucial analytical "keywords and categories" are not explained until after the analysis section, and then only cursorily. No reason is given for the exclusion of "interior decorator" from the keywords in one analysis (p36). At least two out of the four claimed attestations of Doublespeak are quite dubious, namely the claim that "no cap" counts both as an instance of "slang" and "inflated language" (p35), and the claim that use of the word "crew" is an instance of "uplifting euphemism" on the grounds of its French ~ Latin etymology (pp36-37, 51).

Most significantly, the conclusions drawn, along with the premise of the research question itself remains unclear. Why would Coca Cola use Doublespeak in their advertisements at all? In the first part of the conclusion, the author uses a bit too much first-person to express their surprise that Doublespeak occurred in Coke's marketing, since they "expected none" (p53); however, in the final paragraph, it is stated that the use of Doublespeak is "not as extensive and influential as what might be expected" (p55). An explanation of why we might or might not expect the use of "Doublespeak" in advertisements, as opposed to politics, or used by Coca Cola as opposed to other companies, is not given.

Questions to be answered by student:

1. Why do you think that the analytical framework of Doublespeak turned out to be not particularly applicable to the analysis of Coca Cola's social media marketing? What do you think the results would be if you applied Doublespeak to Coke's official responses (e.g. press releases or legal filings) regarding the company's numerous environmental, labor, and other scandals over the years?

2. As discussed in the first section of the thesis, Orwell's main concept of Newspeak was that people's thoughts can restricted by somehow eliminating the words that express those thoughts; at the same time, the meanings of remaining words have to be somehow eliminated (e.g. so that "free" can only mean "without" and not "at liberty"). Isn't this a contradiction in the source material itself? If the way to get rid of meanings (= thoughts) is by eliminating words, how can a meaning be eliminated if there is still a word for it? Or, if it is possible to eliminate a word's meaning while keeping the word, why would any words need to be eliminated at all? Couldn't their meanings just be directly manipulated?

Overall mark[*]		A	B	**C**	D	E	F
Date: 25/05/2024	Signature: Jeffrey Keith Parrott						

---

[*] Overall mark is not a mathematical average of individual marks.