

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: Wagemaker, Puck Anne

Thesis title: The response of Dutch political journalists to the counter-narrative from right-wing populist parties PVV and FvD to the securitization of COVID-1

Reviewer:

Surname and given name: Shavit, Anna

Affiliation: ICSJ 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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Methodology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	Thesis structure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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): The changes in the research proposal are significant but very well explained, and they were beneficial.

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	A
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 presented diploma thesis is a very successful study that skillfully connects theoretical concepts such as populism and securitization on the example of the approach of the Dutch far-wing parties. At the same time, it examines the role of journalists and their ability and readiness to open up complex topics.

The main research question was: How do Dutch political journalists enact when reporting the counter-reaction of right-wing populist parties to the securitization of COVID- 19 in the Netherlands?

Seven interviews were conducted with prominent Dutch journalists to answer the research question. In the same way, the investigated political parties were selected, and other theoretical starting points were formulated.

Subsequently, research was carried out primarily based on semi-structured interviews with the journalist sample.

In the analytical part, the author presents her findings, which document the outputs from individual interviews. Here it is worth emphasizing that the work is extremely clear and readable, and overall, its academic level is very high.

Probably the most exciting part of the work is the one that focuses on how journalists were prepared or able to respond to the statements of the investigated parties. And what responsibility they felt in informing the population about their attitude—clearly showing how difficult the journalist position was during the pandemic concerning the counter-reactions from the right-wing populist parties.

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)	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):
 The work is excellently structured, readable, and brings exciting and revealing findings. The resulting form is a thriving academic work that opens a stimulating debate and perspective on the issue of populism, parties, and securitization.

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

I am pleased to recommend the master thesis for the defense with a grade of A.

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

5.1	How much did you expect journalists' attitudes would be critical of the parties and how much was some of the information wholly new and surprising to you?
5.2	
5.3	
5.4	

6. ANTIPLAGIARISM CHECK

The reviewer is familiar with the thesis‘ URKUND score.

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

6.1	
-----	--

7. 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:September 4, 2022

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.