

**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: Söderholm Emilia

**Thesis title:** One year with the Foreign Espionage Act: Implications to the Freedom of Press in Sweden

**Reviewer:**

Surname and given name: Němcová Tejkalová Alice

Affiliation: Department of Journalism

**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"/>
1.2	Methodology	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	Thesis structure	X	<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):

**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	A
2.3	Quality and soundness of the empirical research	B
2.4	Ability to select the appropriate methods and to use them correctly	B
2.5	Quality of the conclusion	B
2.6	Thesis originality and its contribution to academic knowledge production	A

COMMENTARY (description of thesis content and the main problems): I really appreciate the way you organize thoughts from previous research with your own in theory and how smoothly the text can be read and understood. Regarding the methodology, it is described in a great detail. I would consider random selection, not snowball sampling and at least I would give it a try at the beginning, but I respect your choice, even though it resulted in high number of male participants. I quite strongly disagree of not mentioning the gender aspect when asking for other participants, since what we know from the research, men always think more often about men when recommending the other participant in general. Women tend to think more broadly about both other women and men. There could be very probably relevant women as well, but their male colleagues just did not mention them on the first place. On the other hand, the thematic analysis, according to its precise description, seems to be conducted great. Discussion is meant to be there for the discussion of your findings with what was previously written in scholarly literature. You did it great in parts under the RQs' headings, but Summary of key findings does not belong there. Summary of findings belongs into the Conclusion, and you should lead the reader to it also by the discussion.

**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)	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 defence and suggest disciplinary action against the author instead.

COMMENTARY (description of thesis form and the main problems):  
I particularly dislike having subchapters for just for paragraphs of a text (the case of Methodology).

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

This is a great thesis that I was really happy to read. As I have written before, I appreciated theory as well as very detailed methodology and interesting findings from analysis and their discussion. I have also some objections I have described above, therefore, I grade the thesis by B.

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

5.1	Do you think having more women among the participants could lead to any different results?
5.2	How to optimally balance the state security and press freedom? Where are the trigger points?
5.3	
5.4	

**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	All sources are referenced properly.
-----	--------------------------------------

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

- A  Excellent (excellent performance)
- B  Excellent (excellent performance)
- C  Very Good (above the average standard but with some errors)
- D  Very Good (above the average standard but with some errors)
- E  Good (generally sound work with a number of notable errors)
- F  Fail (unsatisfactory performance)

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

--

Date: September 8, 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.*