

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: Dağdelen, Mazlum Kemal

Affiliation: Institute of Communication Studies and Journalism

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)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Methodology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	Thesis structure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<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): The thesis, with its research objectives, methodology, and structure, is in line with the original research proposal.

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	A
2.4	Ability to select the appropriate methods and to use them correctly	A
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 theoretical framework appears well-chosen and relevant to the research questions. It aligns well with the key themes of the study and provides a solid foundation for the analysis. The thesis demonstrates a good ability to critically engage with the literature, identifying gaps and positioning the research within the broader academic discourse. The empirical research is robust, with a well-defined methodology that supports the research objectives. The data collection and analysis processes are clearly articulated. The methods selected are appropriate for the research questions and are applied correctly, demonstrating a solid understanding of the methodological approaches. The conclusion effectively synthesises the key findings and links them back to the research questions and theoretical framework. It provides a coherent summary of the study's contributions. The author might consider including more explicit reflections on the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research. The thesis offers original insights and contributes meaningfully to the academic field. It addresses a gap in the literature and provides new perspectives on the topic.

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
3.2	Quality of the argumentation	A
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)	A
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):

The thesis structure is clear and logical, with well-defined sections that guide the reader through the research. The progression from introduction to conclusion is coherent. The argumentation is strong and well-supported by evidence from the literature and empirical data. The thesis makes a convincing case for its main arguments. The thesis demonstrates a good grasp of academic terminology, using it correctly and appropriately throughout the text. The citations are relevant and appropriately selected to support the thesis's arguments. Both the theoretical and empirical parts are well-cited, reflecting a thorough engagement with the literature. The thesis generally conforms to the required quotation standards, with proper attribution and formatting of quotes. A review to ensure consistency in quotation marks, citation styles, and reference formatting throughout the document might be necessary. The writing style is formal and appropriate for an academic thesis. The language used is clear, precise, and free from major grammatical or spelling errors. The thesis is well-presented, with a clean and professional layout. The use of headings, subheadings, and formatting is effective in guiding the reader.

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

Maedbh Pierce's thesis meets the academic quality standards and provides a strong academic research. Thus, I suggest to evaluate the thesis with the grade "A" or "B".

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

5.1	Were there any challenges or insights during your research process that influenced your conclusions?
5.2	How do you see your findings contributing to the ongoing academic debate in your field?
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	The result of the automatically generated Turnitin similarity report is 18%. Most of the reported similarities stem from the thesis template and the reference items in the list of references. The thesis generally conforms to the required quotation standards, and thus, can be defended.
-----	---

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:09 September 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.