

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: Di Mauro Teresa

Thesis title: Does gender play a role in peace journalism practices? An analysis of the Armenian and Azerbaijani coverage of the 44 days Karabakh war

Reviewer:

Surname and given name: Dr Neag Annamária

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 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 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): There were significant changes between the proposal and the thesis, but these have been explained in the text.

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 | B |
| 2.3 | Quality and soundness of the empirical research | B |
| 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 | C |

COMMENTARY (description of thesis content and the main problems): The topic of this thesis is very compelling and also important society-wise. However, the methods selected to research this topic can only partially aid the author in finding an answer. The question lingers on throughout the thesis: can one actually give a thorough response to the RQs only by relying on a limited number of interviews? While the theoretical framework is strong, the ability to critically evaluate the literature is somewhat limited. One of the strongest points of the dissertation is the background context through which the author presents the conflict, the gender relations and the media landscape of the two countries.

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 | 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) | C |
| 3.5 | Conformity to quotation standards (*) | A |
| 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 | 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):

There are only smaller errors when it comes to thesis form, such as the use of too many paragraphs without presenting new ideas; the use of too many interview quotes and some problems with the way longer quotes are indented (over 40 words).

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

The dissertation looks at a very important question of today's media landscape, that of the possibilities and pitfalls of peace journalism. Partly because the methodology had to be changed after the proposal was submitted, the author was not able to convincingly answer the research questions. Among the dissertation strengths, one can note the presentation of the background and also the effort done to secure the interviews with both Azerbaijani and Armenian journalists. However, the analysis of the interviews lacks depth and criticality. For instance, the part on the gender aspects is not thorough enough and it is not connected to previous findings. Moreover, it is not clear how the overall findings can be situated within the scholarship focusing on peace journalism, as this aspect is not fully covered in the conclusions.

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

| | |
|-----|--|
| 5.1 | The participants of this study do not think that gender aspects contribute to one's will to apply peace journalism norms. Yet, you argue that 'ingrained gender roles of the two societies help explain why female reporters are more likely than their male colleagues to embrace peace journalism'. Can you please explain this? |
| 5.2 | |
| 5.3 | |
| 5.4 | |

6. ANTIPLAGIARISM CHECK

The reviewer is familiar with the thesis' antiplagiarism system score.

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
B very good (above average but with some weaknesses)
C good (average with some important weaknesses)
D satisfactory (below average with significant weaknesses)
E marginal pass (meeting minimal requirements)
F not recommended for defence

If the mark is an "F", please provide your reasons for not recommending the thesis for defence:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Date: 31.08.2022

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.