



## Master's Thesis Evaluation Form

Student's name: Marija Brnović

Thesis title: Nation, religion and manipulation: Post-war media scene in the countries of the former Yugoslavia

Name of the supervisor: Mgr. Jan Miessler

Name of the opponent: Mgr. Andrea Hružová, Ph.D.

What are the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis? Please give your reasons for the suggested grade in detail below.

1. *Does the author show understanding of one or more theories, and use theory to generate a hypothesis or to make the problem area more understandable.*

Comments:

The theoretical part then covers framing analysis (thoroughly) and sensationalism (adequately). Both are key things playing a central role in the thesis. On the other hand, framing could have been covered in methodology part. Overall, the theoretical part provides useful context for the reader to understand what is at stake in the presented research.

2. *Is the research question articulated clearly and properly? Is the research question sufficiently answered in the conclusion?*

Comments:

Research questions make sense, but hypotheses are not really explained. Also, the author could provide a more detailed argument why commercial and public service media should differ in their nationalist or sensationalist discourse. The conclusion provides a general overview of the whole research as well as general answers to the research questions. In the analysed articles, some problematic discourse was indeed present – but there is no suggestion regarding the reasons for this or anything about the differences between individual media outlets.

3. *Is the thesis based on relevant research and literature and does it accurately summarize and integrate the information?*

Comments:

The literature review provides a comprehensive overview of relevant works, focusing on nationalism, Balkans, and war. It serves as a good and reliable starting point, but there could be more explicit emphasis on the relevancy of the literature for the research itself. In other words, not all discussed items are strictly necessary.



4. *What is the quality of the data or the other sources? Are the sample method, data collection and data analysis appropriate?*

Comments:

The selection of data for analysis is explained at the beginning of the methodology chapter (pp. 34nn). The way how the analysed articles were selected should be discussed as it raises a question whether already the selection criteria themselves do or do not implicitly answer the research questions. On p. 35, the author writes that she wanted to detect the presence of specific elements of war propaganda in her preliminary review. After selecting the data in this way, asking whether propaganda was present or not might be superfluous. Also, the number and origin of analysed articles should be explained clearly.

5. *Are the findings relevant to the research question? Are the conclusions of the thesis based on strong arguments?*

Comments:

The findings are directly related to the research questions. The research framework would allow for a more detailed analysis, this opportunity has not been used, but the results are still sufficient to illustrate how nationalist discourse is still very much alive in the analysed media. As the research does not really work quantitatively, it is not really possible to conclude how important (or marginal) this issue is, but maybe it would require a much larger scope of the research, possibly beyond what is reasonable in a MA thesis.

6. *Are the author's thoughts distinguished unambiguously from the borrowed ideas?*

Comments:

The author quotes her sources properly.

7. *Is the thesis containing original/innovative research (in terms of topic, approach, and/or findings)?*

Comments:

The research makes sense, but mostly confirms what has been expected and does not bring surprising or innovative results.

8. *What is the quality of style and other formal requirements?*

Comments:

The thesis is structured and orderly, but there is some room for improvement. There are occasional typos.

9. *Are there any other strengths and weaknesses of the thesis, which are not included in the previous questions? Please list them if any.*



Comments:

There could be more discussion regarding how strong the conclusions really are, given the methods and data used. On the other hand, the author knows her field very well.

10. *What topic do you suggest for the discussion in the thesis defence?*

Comments:

I would like to suggest following topic:

Is there any substantial difference between public service and commercial media? What would such a difference – or its absence – mean?

11. *Declaration that the supervisor has read the result of the originality check in the system: [2%] Theses [ ] Turnitin [ ] Original (Urkund)*

Supervisor's comment on the originality check result:

Turnitin identifies almost complete similarity of the submitted thesis with a text (not available to verify) at Universidad Miguel Hernandez, including title page, author's thanks to the supervisor etc. This must clearly be an error, as the supervisor never worked in Spain and observed development of the thesis over the months here in Prague.

Overall assessment of the thesis:

*(Please, state clearly whether the thesis is or is not recommended for a defence and write the main reasons for the recommendation).*

I recommend the thesis for the defence.

The author knows her field, work with a robust research framework that is adequate to allow her to answer her research questions.

Proposed grade: B-C

*(A- B: excellent, C-D: very good, E: good, F: fail)*

Date: September 18, 2023

Signature: