Master's Thesis Review: Supervisor's Evaluation Form

Student's name: *Samina Nørgaard*

Thesis title: ***"Women's experience of gynecological examinations: embodiment and malpractice in care"***

Name of the supervisor: Dr Ema Hrešanová

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 an understanding of one or more theories, and use theory to generate a hypothesis or to make the problem area more understandable?

Comments:
I think the author makes a perfect use of relevant theories and core theoretical concepts (such as embodiment, Lock and Schepher-Hughes' *three bodies* approach; medical gaze or structural violence) from the field of medical anthropology to approach the subject and interpret her data.

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

Comments:
Yes, the research question as well as the aim of the study is clearly articulated, and the overall objective is well justified in the introductory section. The thesis' findings and conclusions aptly respond to these.

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

Comments:
The author has conducted an extensive study combining ethnographic methods (particularly participant observations in two clinical settings in Prague and auto-ethnographic techniques) with semi-structured interviews with nine women of various national background and expert interviews with medical practitioners. She uses relevant literature to shed light on her findings and provide analytical insights into the phenomenon of pain during routine gynaecological examinations.

4.   What is the quality of the data or the other sources? Are the methods (sampling, data collection and data analysis) appropriate?

Comments:
The author conducted qualitative research combining various research methods (ranging from auto-ethnographic techniques to participant observation and semi-structured and expert interviews with a diversity of interlocutors). Overall, the research design is very well justified.

Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences
Institute of Sociological Studies, Department of Sociology
U kříže 8, 158 00 Prague 5 / iss.fsv.cuni.cz / jana.vojanova@fsv.cuni.cz / +420 778 465 054

www.fsv.cuni.cz
1/3

I especially appreciate Samina's reflexivity and honest approach to the data creation process. As a result, her study brings novel and relevant insights into a little-known area of women's health. I believe her findings shall be of interest to many medical anthropologists working in gender and health domain, but also to medical practitioners and others interested in improving reproductive care.

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

Comments:
Overall, the study has a clear and well formulated argument based on rigorous empirical research, which neatly responds to the study's research questions and objectives.

6.   *Evaluate the progress of the thesis and the innovative and original contribution of the author (e.g., in terms of topic, approach, and/or findings). Was the work regularly consulted?*

Comments:
Samina's choice of the topic is admirable. She chose a crucial, yet an overlooked issue, and approached it with the right analytical angle. I especially appreciate her innovative approach in research methodology. The result of her research endeavour brings highly relevant insights into a little studied domain of women's lives.
I find Samina's work on the thesis exemplary. She regularly consulted her ideas and research steps with me. I appreciate her innovative contributions to the anthropology of reproduction and women's health and medical anthropology in general.

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

Comments:
I am also very appreciative of Samina's approach to the photographic illustration of the themes that have come to the fore in her research.
As concerns the weaknesses, the text seems to be slightly repetitive in last two chapters. I was also puzzled by details about Military University Hospital in Prague, and whether this was a pseudonym as well or not. The first time the anonymized name is mentioned, it should be accompanied by a statement indicating this.

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

Comments:
Could you tell us whether you have had the opportunity to consult your MA thesis with your interlocutors and what their responses were? I am especially interested in the medical doctors' view and in the ethical approval concerned.

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

Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences
Institute of Sociological Studies, Department of Sociology
U kříže 8, 158 00 Prague 5 / iss.fsv.cuni.cz / jana.vojanova@fsv.cuni.cz / +420 778 465 054

www.fsv.cuni.cz
2/3

Supervisor's comment on the originality check result: *No breach of rules detected.*

Overall assessment of the thesis:
I recommend the thesis for defence, as I appreciate its high quality in terms of conducted research, the relevant findings it brings and its conclusions.

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

Proposed grade:

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

I propose to grade the thesis as excellent (A).

Date: *8ᵗʰ September 2024*   Signature:

* **A** (**Excellent**. The student has shown excellent performance, originality and displayed an exceptional grasp of the subject.), **B** (**Very Good**. The student understands the subject well and has shown some originality of thought. Above the average performance, but with some errors.), **C** (**Good**. Generally sound work with a number of notable errors.), **D** (**Satisfactory**. The student has shown some understanding of the subject matter, but has not succeeded in translating this understanding into consistently original work. Overall good performance with a number of significant errors.), **E** (**Sufficient**. Acceptable performance with significant drawbacks. Performance meets the minimum requirements.), **F** (**Fail**. The student has not succeeded in mastering the subject matter of the course.)

Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences
Institute of Sociological Studies, Department of Sociology
U kříže 8, 158 00 Prague 5 / iss.fsv.cuni.cz / jana.vojanova@fsv.cuni.cz / +420 778 465 054

www.fsv.cuni.cz
3/3