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: Márkus Maja Olívia

Thesis title:

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)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.2	Methodology	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.3	Thesis structure	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

COMMENTARY (description of the relationship between the research proposal and the thesis. If there are problems, please be specific): No major problems noted.

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	A
2.3	Quality and soundness of the empirical research	B
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	B

COMMENTARY (description of thesis content and the main problems):The theoretical framework was well chosen for this project.The literature review is thorough and presented in adequate manner. In terms of methodology, it is unclear how the qualitative content analysis of Instagram was actually performed. Although the findings on self-presentation are engaging, this part remains somewhat descriptive, as the author does not provide a critical discussion (e.g. why is curation important in this case?). The thesis provided interesting insights on feminism and the power of the algorithm, so these aspects could have been explored more in depth.

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	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)	A
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 thesis conforms to expected academic writing standards.

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

This is a solid MA dissertation, with a number of strengths, such as the theoretical framework and the literature review. The empirical research is also strong when it comes to the semi-structured interviews. However, the qualitative content analysis of the social media posts is not adequately presented and some of the conclusions stay at a descriptive level. The dissertation adheres to expected academic writing standards.

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

5.1	How was the qualitative content analysis of the Instagram posts carried out?
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:30.08.2022   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.