

Film and TV School of the Academy of Performing Arts in Prague
Department of Photography

Assessment of the Bachelor's Thesis

Author of thesis: Elizaveta Gershkovich

Title of thesis: The expression of gender characteristics in magazine on the example of the USA Vogue magazine

Assessment of the primary advisor

Assessment of the opponent

Author of the assessment (first name, last name, workplace): Václav Janoščík, KF FAMU

Evaluation of the content and final form of the thesis (A/excellent – B/very good – C/good – D/good with objections – E/satisfactory – F/unsatisfactory – not recommended for defence)

Suitability of the selected objective and work approach.....	E
Relative completeness of the literature used for the selected topic.....	E
Ability to critically evaluate and use professional literature.....	E
Logicity of the thesis structure, connection of its chapters.....	B
Language and stylistic level of the thesis.....	B
Compliance with citation norms (should the text repeatedly contain adopted passages without citing the source, the work cannot be recommended for defence).....	C
Sufficient extent of image attachments, justifiability and suitability of attachments, graphic layout.....	E
Originality of the thesis, contribution to the development of the field of study.....	E
Overall evaluation of the thesis.....	E

Verbal evaluation of the thesis including questions that the diplomate must address in his/her thesis defence:

Bachelor thesis of Elizaveta Gershkovich focuses on the Vogue magazine and its treatment of gender categories. The author naturally starts with defining gender, but pick up almost exclusively on linguistic theories, omits not only visual theories but feminism itself. Second part consist in review of history of Vogue. Although it does go into some depth this chapter often lapses into journalistic style lacking any criticality or references and sources.

Finally the research part comes in where the author “analyzed 9 articles from the May 2017 edition of *Vogue USA*“. Unluckily there is no explanation or justification of the „method“ nor the material, both of which seem rather random. Despite the relatively thorough analysis (in categories such as vocabulary, expression, intensifiers, softenings, colours, politeness) of selected texts the only conclusion consist in confirmation of the stereotypical „female“ discourse: „In this manner, the analyzed

texts, indeed, portray the world through a lens of women's interests in a patriarchal society: food, clothing, flowers, love." (p. 25)

The so called conclusion of the whole work only summarizes respective parts of the analysis. Critical evaluation, explanation of relevancy, consequences of female discursivity, feminist ramifications and other important aspects of such work are missing. The more reader delve into the text the more he or she confronts the problem of relevancy of the text itself.

Formal and stylistic level of the text is poor (annotation is lacking, page numbers are missing in the entire text and even in the table of contents, use of endnotes instead of footnotes), and the endnotes are entirely absent in the version of the text from KOS.

What can be positively evaluated is immense investment and high level of sophistication in abstract linguistic or discursive issues. Nonetheless these are not contextualized in terms of relevancy, relation to photography, or even original conclusion. The work seems to be written for the field of sociolinguistics; the connection to art and photography is dubious if not entirely absent (for instance historical remark on p. 16).

Therefore I recommend the thesis for defense with the overall evaluation E.

Question for the defense:

Can you rephrase the conclusion in terms of what you have actually come up with?

What role does the gender stereotypization play in art or photography?

Date:

Signature:.....