

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: Bartelmus Elisabeth

Thesis title: (Re)presentation of female action sports athletes - A framing analysis of selected Red Bull action sports movies

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<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, with necessary minor changes being made. Because the candidate had an intention to count and quantify certain aspects, the methodology of the thesis contain simple quantitative analysis, as well as initially planned framing analysis, which remains to be a core method.

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	B
2.2	Ability to critically evaluate and apply the literature	C
2.3	Quality and soundness of the empirical research	C
2.4	Ability to select the appropriate methods and to use them correctly	C
2.5	Quality of the conclusion	C
2.6	Thesis originality and its contribution to academic knowledge production	B

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

The candidate adopted feminism as a theoretical framework. I think it generally works well, but during the reading of the thesis, there were some moments when I questioned whether this choice did not distract attention from the research topic itself (although I understand that the theory and research are interconnected). The literature introduced in the thesis is relevant, but the studies from 2021 onwards are rarely cited. However, the candidate proved that she can present theoretical knowledge in a sound way. She was able to critically evaluate and apply the literature, which was demonstrated both in the Literature review and Theoretical section. The candidate was able to select the appropriate methods and to use them correctly. In my opinion, the results of the quantitative analysis were presented convincingly; on the other hand, I think that the results of the framing analysis were a bit over-quantified. I appreciate that the candidate mentioned the limitations of her research, but I would welcome if they were more developed. The candidate summed up the results of her research in the Discussion and Conclusion. The topic of the thesis is original and contributes to the academic knowledge in the field of media 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	C
3.3	Appropriate use of academic terminology	B
3.4	Quality, quantity and appropriateness of the citations (both in the theory part and in the empirical part)	C
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 defense and suggest disciplinary action against the author instead.

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

The structure of the thesis is logical. The candidate is able to support her claims with evidence and use the academic terminology of media studies. The text conforms to quotation standards; hence facts are properly sourced. In my opinion, the amount of direct quotations could be lower, but their proportion in the text does not exceed the enabled maximum. In some cases, the paraphrases do not differ substantially from the statements in the original texts. The thesis is written in the academic writing style but it includes shortenings (such as “doesn’t”) that should not appear in the academic text, and the first letters of some words are incorrectly capitalized. The lay-outing is on the average level (generally good, but with some minor mistakes that do not complicate reading).

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

MA thesis written by Elisabeth Barthelmus deserves to be defended. The quality of the thesis is above average, but it contains minor mistakes and deficiencies presented above in my review. Because of that, I suggest a grade “C” (very good).

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

5.1	Please, present one study/book chapter/book that may be relevant to your research topic (theory- or literature review-wise) that was published in the last two years (2022 onwards).
5.2	In your opinion, how will Red Bull action films deal (or already deals) with the issue of gender in the following years, as this category is no longer binary?

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 similarity was detected mainly in the direct quotations and paraphrases; hence the sources were appropriately disclosed. I think this is not problematic.
-----	--

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 defense:

-

Date: 19. 1. 2025

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.