

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: Bartlemus 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: Němcová Tejkalová Alice

Affiliation: Department of Journalism, ICSJ

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"/>	X	<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):

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 - C
2.2	Ability to critically evaluate and apply the literature	B - C
2.3	Quality and soundness of the empirical research	C
2.4	Ability to select the appropriate methods and to use them correctly	D
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): I really liked reading the Literature Review and have only one objection. Data presented about the mediatization of women's sport are quite old. More recent literature shows that during the Olympic Games representation of female athletes have been in some aspects more prominent than male athletes. It is a recent positive trend and we have to wait if it will continue, still it is something that should be reflected in the literature review. I would also welcome increased number of the more recent (published after 2019, in the last 5 years) literature in Theoretical Section + I believe that the author too much depends on the work of Thorpe (even though I consider it pretty valuable).

I appreciate the whole Methodology chapter. The research questions are set properly and according to the research objectives, the analyzed sample looks robust, the methods' selection is explained persuasively.

In quantitative findings, I would oppose the scale of sports based on risk assessment (p. 41) since this scale is purely anecdotic based. The author takes into the account mainly content of particular movies and it does not make sense to me why this is important. It can be different in another movie and to say that women are presented in less dangerous movies can be done without this scale.

I do not understand why the author is presenting the quantitative results in a table (p. 44) in the qualitative part of the analysis. To count the frames and select “the most prominent ones” is against the logic of a qualitative research. When the author selects Dan’s approach to the framing analysis, I also do not understand while the analysis was not conducted according to it and the frames were not presented in that way. When the author wrote later that she did not use the approach as it was designed by Dan, then I would select another approach I would fully use.

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	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 (*)	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	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):

I like the structure of a thesis, I would only put the limitations of the study to the conclusion, I would not start the Discussion out of sudden with them.

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

It is a very good thesis, based on nicely written literature review and theoretic framework with an appropriately selected methods. The execution of the analysis is not so great, the findings are sound, bring the interesting inputs but the qualitative part seems to be led more by the quantitative measures, which does not serve the thesis well.

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

5.1	Can you explain the difference between quantitative and qualitative analysis?
5.2	How could you deepen the qualitative aspect of your thesis?
5.3	
5.4	

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	No problems indicated, the sources referenced.
-----	------------------------------------------------

7. SUGGESTED GRADE OF THE THESIS AS A WHOLE (choose one or two)

- A Excellent (excellent performance)
 B Excellent (excellent performance)
 C X 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: January 27, 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.