

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: Minsky Helena

Thesis title: Constructions of Coastal Conservation in Ireland

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)	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Methodology	X <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"/>	X <input type="checkbox"/>

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

The structure of the submitted thesis - specifically the order of chapters - deviates slightly from the approved plan, but the deviation is logical and contributed to the clarity of the thesis.

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

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

In principle, the work meets the requirements for a professional social science text - only the question of its disciplinary classification remains.

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	A
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 present thesis aims "to answer how the coastal space and its conservation are articulated within state legislation and the Biodiversity Action Plans", thus situating itself more between environmental studies, to which it subscribes explicitly, and the analysis of political or state legal communication.

The thesis is essentially based on a discursive analysis of relevant legal writings ("How is Ireland's coast and its conservation constructed in legislation and Biodiversity Plans?"), and is thus more of a contribution to understanding the construction of environment as conceived by the Irish government and its legal outputs (namely National Biodiversity Action Plans).

The thesis is structured into five broad chapters framed by an introduction and conclusion. In each chapter, the thesis progressively presents a literature review (the state of the art - including an excursus into the discursive approach to environmental studies), a theoretical framework and methodology, then its own analysis of (mainly) legal documents, and finally a discussion of the results of the analysis.

Although the work presented here is overlooked in its focus on environmental studies, it can be seen as a contribution to the use of discursive analysis to understand the specific social (in this case legal) construction of a selected sociopolitical phenomenon. However, the question of how and to what extent this work contributes to the field in which it is to be defended remains.

Anyway, 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 23rd, 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.