

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: Abbasli Pari

Thesis title: Behind the Byline: Gender Dynamics in Azerbaijani Media from the Perspective of Female Journalists

Reviewer:

Surname and given name: Turková Kateřina

Affiliation: KŽ 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 type="checkbox"/>	x	<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"/>
1.3	Thesis structure	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<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 title, structure, and research objectives slightly differ from those stated in the proposal, but these changes are well explained and appropriate. The goal of the thesis follows the proposal.

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	A
2.6	Thesis originality and its contribution to academic knowledge production	A

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

The candidate was able to conduct a thorough review of the academic literature; hence, the “iconic” literature, as well as actual studies, were mentioned. Despite the theoretical framework and literature review being high-quality, the candidate could be more critical and reflective in some passages, especially in the part devoted to critical feminist theory. The selected method allowed the candidate to gain the information needed for the analysis, and the whole research was conducted correctly. The candidate took into account the needs and privacy of the respondents, which is a key aspect of research that involves human participants. The conclusions drawn from the research are sound, and the presentation of them is clear. The thesis covers an important topic, it is an original text that importantly contributes to academic knowledge production in the field of journalism studies.

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	A
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	A

(*) 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 defense and suggest disciplinary action against the author instead.

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

The text is clearly and logically structured. The candidate was able to support her claims by the evidence, and present the results of the research while using appropriate academic terminology. The referencing style is used correctly, and the text conforms to quotation standards. There is a mistake on the title page - the study program of the candidate is not "Journalism." The candidate skillfully uses an academic writing style, language and stylistic mistakes occur only occasionally. The Appendix contains the interview guide in English and Azerbaijani, which can be handy if there will be a chance to replicate the research in other countries or later on.

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

If the candidate seeks to cover a topic that has a personal value for them, it is not an easy task. I think that in the case of Pari Abbasli's MA thesis, personal knowledge of the environment became an advantage both in the theoretical part and in the research process. The candidate proved that she is able to conduct research aimed at a sensitive topic and summarize the knowledge gained from the process. She also took into account various possible limitations, as well as ethical aspects. Due to the aforementioned facts, I suggest the grade "A".

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

5.1	How would the results of similar research differ in Denmark or the Czech Republic? (in your opinion)
5.2	Were there any factors that you thought would be challenging for female journalists in Azerbaijan that were not shown/confirmed in the research? Which? (Why?)

6. ANTIPLAGIARISM CHECK

X The reviewer is familiar with the thesis' score in plagiarism analysis in SIS.

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

6.1	The overall similarity due to the Turnitin report is 10 %. The detected passages are mainly references, direct quotations, or parts of the recommended thesis structure. Due to that, I do not see any problem related to the similarity check.
-----	---

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

- A**
- B**
- C**
- D**
- E**
- F**

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

-

Date: 15/06/2024

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.