

**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 Bøgh Ole

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

**Reviewer:**

Surname and given name: Macková Veronika

Affiliation: ICSJ FSS CU

**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 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): The author of the final thesis promised 20 interviews in the research proposal, which he was unable to collect due to non-communication of the respondents.

**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	B
2.5	Quality of the conclusion	B
2.6	Thesis originality and its contribution to academic knowledge production	A

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

The author works with relevant sources in the thesis's theoretical part and can critically evaluate and apply them. I consider the Turing test problematic because the sample texts were presented to respondents as only one sentence or concise paragraphs, which may have biased the results. I would not show the results of this test in percentages because the student worked with only a minimal number of respondents (e.g., page 46 or 49). AI technologies represent a critical challenge to journalism. This is a very interesting topic for a thesis, even though many academic researchers have not focused on this topic before. Ole Bøgh Ellekrog's research also follows the academic papers produced at the Faculty of Social Sciences. The author supports his results with literature and presents exciting findings.

**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)	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):

The author has made significant progress since the first version of the thesis, which is reflected mainly in interpreting the results. The student follows the citation standard, and the text is written in an academic writing style (except for some minor details).

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

**As a supervisor, I am satisfied with the final work that Ole Bøgh Ellekrog has presented, although his research has limitations. Because of the Turing test, I cannot give the best grade, and I find this part of the research problematic. I evaluate the thesis between B-C.**

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

5.1	Which European country uses automated journalism the most? Why is this country the most progressive in this area?
5.2	At what level are the texts produced by the robotic reporter? Will the human reporter be replaced in the short term?
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	
-----	--

**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:

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.*