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 x

Thesis author:
Surname and given name: Lobna Sabet Amin Awwad
Thesis title: Echoes of a War: A Multimodal Discourse Analysis of Egypt's *Al-Ahram*'s Five-Decade Coverage of the 1973 Egyptian-Israeli War
Reviewer:
Surname and given name: Silverio Robert
Affiliation: 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				
1.2	Methodology	X				
1.3	Thesis structure	X				

COMMENTARY (description of the relationship between the research proposal and the thesis. If there are problems, please be specific):

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-B
2.2	Ability to critically evaluate and apply the literature	A
2.3	Quality and soundness of the empirical research	A-B
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):
In her thesis, Lobna Sabet Amin Awwad tried to analyze the change in the narrative of the 1973 Egyptian-Israeli War during several decades and changes in political regimes. The introduction provides a detailed historical background of the October 1973 War, its aftermath, and the media's role in Egypt, which sets a solid foundation for understanding the subject. The research questions are well-defined, focusing on the evolution of media discourse and the relationship between media narratives and political power.

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-B
3.2	Quality of the argumentation	A-B
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 (*)	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): Formal Imperfections:
- "Multimodal Critical Discourse Analysis (MDA)" and "social semiotics" are used interchangeably, which could confuse readers unfamiliar with these concepts.
- Some minor inconsistencies, such as "October 6th" vs. "6 October."
- The scans of the newspapers might have been better.

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

The text incorporates a variety of sources, including both historical accounts and contemporary analyses, which enriches the discussion.
The research design and methodology are comprehensive, using both Multimodal Discourse Analysis (MDA) and semi-structured interviews. This mixed-methods approach offers a holistic view of how Al-Ahram has narrated the war and its alignment with political power.

The theoretical framework section is robust, integrating a range of scholarly perspectives on the Media Construction of Reality theory. It provides a thorough understanding of how media constructs reality through various lenses, such as gatekeeping, framing, and social constructivism.

The findings are thorough, well-argued, and well-based. If there are any weak points, I believe the entire set of interviews should have been included in the appendix, not just the questions. This is even more important because information from semi-structured interviews is not mentioned sufficiently in the text of the thesis. Generally, I believe that the semi-structured interviews method was used less efficiently than MDA.

I suggest the this should be accepted and graded A or B depending on the student's defence.

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

5.1	Wasn't it possible to incorporate the interviews slighlt more n the text?
5.2	This question goes beyond the frame of the thesis itself, but could you elaborate on circulation of the newspaper and its reach and acceptance?
5.3	
5.4	

6. ANTIPLAGIARISM CHECK

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	

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: 01/09/24   Signature: …………………………..