

**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: de Sá Ribas Guebert Leonardo

**Thesis title:** Beyond the Scoreboard: Examining Media Activism related to the FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022 to the 2023 FIFA Women's World Cup

**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)	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 objectives, methodology, and thesis structure conform to the approved research proposal. The minor changes are well explained and appropriate.

**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	C
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 candidate proved that he is able to work with academic literature and further apply the knowledge gained by the review of the literature. He was able to select the appropriate method and use it correctly in his research. The analysis is a bit descriptive - I think that the results could be interpreted with more self-confidence, which would help to support the candidate's interpretation even more. The interconnection of theory and empirical parts is sometimes not clearly accented; hence it should be.

I appreciate that the candidate was able to work independently and had the courage to focus on the difficult topic (that had further consequences and led to difficulties in the research process). The thesis is original and contributes to academic knowledge production not only through the results but also by bringing the debate if it is possible to compare media approach/coverage of female and male sports (events).

**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	B
3.4	Quality, quantity and appropriateness of the citations (both in the theory part and in the empirical part)	B

3.5	Conformity to quotation standards (*)	B
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	B

(\*) 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):

Overall, the thesis form is solid. The structure makes sense, the academic terminology is correctly used, and the referencing style is consistent and conforms to the quotation standard. The language and stylistic mistakes are rare. The textual lay-outing corresponds with the standards at the Institute.

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

**Leonardo de Sá Ribas Guebert's MA thesis deals with the topic of media activism, while it is focused on the FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022 and the 2023 FIFA Women's World Cup. It proved to be a difficult task, as the comparison between male and female soccer events is still almost impossible (although female soccer is nowadays on the rise). Despite the candidate highlighted this fact in the Discussion and Conclusion (that are in my opinion the best parts of the whole thesis, when the candidate demonstrated the ability of academic argumentation), the differences could be also explained in the Theoretical part, which is slightly shorter than ideal. The analysis is thoroughly done; hence it is presented in a highly descriptive manner. However, the thesis as a whole is a good piece of work with some minor mistakes. I think that this MA thesis deserves to be defended, and I suggest evaluating it with a grade "B" or "C", due to the thesis defense.**

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

5.1	How do you define "media activism"? What are the topics that could be persuaded as "activistic" due to your opinion?
5.2	How does the media coverage of female sports differ from the media coverage of male sports? (In general - in your opinion)
5.3	Do you think that the results of your research would be different, e.g., in Latin America? Why? / Why not?

**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, according to the Turnitin system, is 32%. 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 defense:

-

Date: June 15, 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.*