

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: Pierce Maedbh

Thesis title: "You're not gay. Why are you pretending to be?" A Critical Discourse Analysis Of Bisexual Identity Construction Across Monosexual and Bisexual International Media Between The Years 2012 - 2022

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; hence necessary minor changes and adjustments were made during the process of writing.

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	B
2.4	Ability to select the appropriate methods and to use them correctly	B
2.5	Quality of the conclusion	A
2.6	Thesis originality and its contribution to academic knowledge production	B

COMMENTARY (description of thesis content and the main problems):

The candidate proved that she is able to review and use the relevant academic literature on the chosen topic. She was able to critically discuss the current studies in the theoretical part of the thesis. The candidate was able to adopt the appropriate method for analysis allowing her to respond to the posed research questions, CDA, and satisfactorily explained her choice. She also provided an extensive overview of the use of CDA in the studies that examined similar topics. I appreciate that the candidate (though briefly) addressed the ethical considerations and the researcher's position. The analysis is highly descriptive but still solid, and the candidate then successfully summed up the gained knowledge and answered the research questions.

The topic of the thesis is original, and it contributes to the academic knowledge production in the media and gender studies.

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	A
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	C

(*) 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 structure of the thesis is logical, still, there are some non-standard (not necessarily bad) items, such as Thesis Outline and Thesis Statement as subchapters following the Introduction. Also, it is rarely referred to the literature in the Abstract. The quality of the textual-lay outing is average; there are minor overlooks, such as the non-edited Declaration (and this is actually important. I would like to know what softwares and tools the candidate used), capitalized indefinite articles in the headings and dots at the ends of some headings, missing descriptions of graphic elements, etc. Also, the spacing varies, and sometimes it makes the text hard to read. The thesis has no appendices.

The candidate is able to use academic language and terms. She refers to the sources of information; the variations/mistakes in formatting and citation style are rare.

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

I think that the topic of this MA thesis is original, and Maedbh Pierce proved that she is able to produce sound piece of academic research. On the basis of the remarks above, I suggest to evaluate this MA thesis with a grade "B".

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

5.1	What approach towards the construction of bisexual identity is, in your opinion, the closest to "ideal", and why? (+ vice versa)
5.2	How is the construction of bisexual identity rooted in the current popular culture?
5.3	If you had a chance to adopt another method for the analysis, which one would you choose (and why)?

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 indicated by Turnitin is 18%. The indicated passages contain mostly direct quotations, thesis template, or references; hence. the MA thesis is not problematic in this aspect.
-----	---

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: 1. 9. 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.