

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: Allegra Diamond

Thesis title: Female War Correspondents and Access in Conflict Zones

Reviewer:

Surname and given name: Veronika Macková

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)	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): Research objective, methodology and thesis structure correspond to the approved research 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	B
2.2	Ability to critically evaluate and apply the literature	B
2.3	Quality and soundness of the empirical research	C
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):

The presented diploma thesis has an exciting topic, which is still very current. Allegra Diamond chose semi-structured interviews as the main method, which I consider correct in this case, but it is important to place the research results more in context. As I already indicated during the consultations, the division into advantages and disadvantages (positives and negatives) is not entirely ideal, because what is positive for one woman can be perceived as negative by another. For example, the author writes that the information from the literature that "sometimes being underestimated by male sources led to gaining more information" has been confirmed, but this statement may, on the contrary, be perceived negatively by someone, and some women may not feel comfortable that they are underestimated by men or at least

they wouldn't call it an advantage. It was the same in the chapter on disadvantages. I'd rather sort it by topic.

Despite these comments, I consider the work to be of high quality and of great benefit. Interviews with female war correspondents were great and brought the perspective of women and the challenges of their work.

What I consider beneficial are chapters 4.5 Limitations and Future Research and 4.6 Conclusion. Both chapters provide interesting insights and excellent reflection on this topic.

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	C
3.3	Appropriate use of academic terminology	B
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)	A
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):

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

I consider Allegra Diamond's thesis very beneficial in the field of journalism, and that is why I propose to rate "B" as Excellent.

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

5.1	How difficult was it to sort the results from the interviews into individual thematic areas?
5.2	What was a surprising discovery for you during the interviews (what did you not expect)?
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	18 %
-----	------

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:

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.