

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: Ellekrog Ole Bøgh

Thesis title: The rise of the robo-journalists: What human journalists think of the creativity of their AI colleagues

Reviewer:

Surname and given name: Němcová Tejkalová Alice

Affiliation: 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Methodology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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): I understand the reduction in interviewees due to the C-19 pandemics and everything else. Still, I think it is not good for a quantitative part of the research.

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	B
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	B
2.6	Thesis originality and its contribution to academic knowledge production	B

COMMENTARY (description of thesis content and the main problems): The theoretic part is not exhaustive, but a solid one, using relevant sources, well written. There are some difficulties with the methodology. Research questions should be at the beginning of the chapter, contextualized well and set into the theoretical paradigm. The selected methods are well chosen but more appropriate for the initial number of respondents mentioned in the proposal that has reduced significantly. To use the quantitative analysis for 10 answers is definitely not recommended. To present the numbers like 1 journalist out of 10 is perfect, to use percents is unfortunate. At the same time the findings are interesting, I really like the interviews and I would use much more of them in the thesis. Anyway, it is great they were added to the thesis as an Appendix.

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	C

3.2	Quality of the argumentation	B
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)	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)	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):

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

It is a very good thesis, presenting interesting results, sometimes, unfortunately, more of them in the Appendices than in the main body of work. The topic is original, trendy in the recent academic sphere, and the research is firmly founded on quite robust theoretic part. Therefore, I suggest to grade it between B-C, depending on the quality of defense.

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

5.1	Why the asked interviewees were not interested in your research (if they responded to you)?
5.2	Do you think the results of your "mini-Turing Test" would be different if the interviewees were common journalists, not working with AI and not mixed with AI experts?
5.3	
5.4	

6. ANTIPLAGIARISM CHECK

The reviewer is familiar with the thesis' URKUND score.

If the score is above 5%, please evaluate and indicate problems:

6.1	Sources are properly referenced.
-----	----------------------------------

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: 5th September 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.