

**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: Nikolaos Alexandros Goudis

**Thesis title:**

**Reviewer:**

Surname and given name: Sandra Lábová

Affiliation: IKSŽ

**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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Methodology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	Thesis structure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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):

**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 use them correctly	A
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 theoretical part of the thesis is well-developed. Nikolaos Alexandros Goudis examines the topic thoroughly. The main objectives and aims are clearly explained. Goudis aims to investigate the visual representation of the three weeks of the Hamas-Israel war in 2023 in three selected outlets through the lens of selected news values, using quantitative content analysis. The first chapter (TF) focuses on the power of images and the myth of truth. Goudis discusses the main concepts and concerns presented in core scholarly literature. Similarly, the discussion on news values in the same chapter is well-developed. The literature review provides a comprehensive overview of the relevant research.

In the context of the thesis, the evaluation of research focusing on war photojournalism is very appropriate. Furthermore, Goudis reviews some of the research on media coverage of the conflicts between Israel and Palestine over several decades. The writing is clear, and the author offers a distinct perspective. My only suggestion would be to include the subchapter “2.3 News Values in News Photographs” within the theoretical framework. Table 1 in the same subchapter would be more appropriately placed in Chapter 3, Methodology, as it presents theoretical ideas and the construction of new values in photographs, which is relevant to

Goudis's research design. However, overall, the theoretical framework and literature review provide a solid foundation for the research.

Chapter 3, Methodology, provides an overview of the research design and details how the research was conducted using quantitative content analysis. In this chapter, Goudis briefly discusses the theoretical background of the chosen method. In subchapter 3.2.7, "Validity and Reliability," Goudis addresses the reliability of the research. To ensure reliability, Goudis employs an intracoder reliability test, which is measured in percentages. While percentage agreement is the most straightforward measure of coder agreement, it is appropriate given the scope of the MA thesis research.

The presentation of the results is understandable and accurate, providing a solid foundation for the study's findings. It offers some intriguing insights, though it should be noted that specific outcomes were anticipated, possibly due to the nature of the research or prior studies in the field. The figures are presented correctly and clearly, aiding in the visual interpretation of the data and enhancing the reader's understanding.

However, the clarity and impact of the presentation could be further improved. One key area for enhancement is a more concentrated focus on the topic and the structure of the actors involved. This could be achieved by clearly delineating these elements within each subchapter. By doing so, the narrative would become more cohesive, allowing readers to follow better the logical progression of the arguments and the relationships between different research components. The merging of topic and actor discussions into broader descriptions, such as those of news values, may dilute the specificity and depth of analysis. On the other hand, the hypothesis is tested correctly.

Similarly, the discussion is well-conducted, demonstrating the author's solid understanding of the studied topic. The author effectively situates their findings within a theoretical framework and existing scholarly literature, which helps contextualize the results and underscores their relevance.

### 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	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 (*)	A
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	A

(\*) 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):

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

**Nikolaos Alexandros Goudis's thesis thoroughly examines the visual representation of the 2023 Hamas-Israel war through quantitative content analysis, focusing on news values. The comprehensive theoretical framework covers critical concepts relevant to the research objectives, and the literature review discusses research focused on war photojournalism and media coverage of the Israel-Palestine conflict. The methodology is clearly outlined, with reliability addressed via an intracoder reliability test. While the presentation of results is clear and informative, it could benefit from a more distinct delineation of topics and actors. The thesis offers valuable insights but could be enhanced by refining the structure and focus, and thus, I suggest evaluation A-B, depending on the defense.**

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

5.1	How do you address potential biases in the news outlets you selected, and how might these biases influence the visual representation of the conflict in your study?
5.2	
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: August 8, 2024

Signature: .....

<p><i>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.</i></p>
---

<p><i>Do not upload PDFs with a scanned signature, the review uploaded to SIS must be without signature.</i></p>
--