

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: Social media activism: an analysis of how climate activists use Instagram and encourage green behaviour among their followers.

Reviewer:

Surname and given name: Shavit, Anna

Affiliation: IKSŽ MKPR FSV UK

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 clearly explains the changes she made.

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	B
2.4	Ability to select the appropriate methods and to use them correctly	A
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):As the author says: "this master thesis investigated how climate activists portray themselves on Instagram and encourage offline green actions of their followers." The topic is fascinating, and the authors present many striking insights about the issue of climate change and especially about the influencers. The most significant advantage of the thesis is the neat research design and conducted interviews with social media personas. Slightly debatable is the sample selection process, and one could suggest that what is missing is any criteria analyzing the person's qualification. I understood the critical component here were motivation and followers.

The author skillfully creates the social construct of the climate activist; however, she presents her research design, and the research questions are solid. The most impressive part of the thesis is the interviews conducted by the author. Although she is "demasking" many issues related to the Instagram world, one substantial question comes back over and over. What is the core of the research - is the author analyzing the people, the cause, the medium, or the communication itself? Another question is - how relevant is the presented sample?

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)	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 presented thesis is an independent research project which is very solid. The most significant criticism is focusing on the construction of the interviewed people. The author explains how she created the samples, but it brings more additional questions, which in the end, are crucial for the whole research itself.

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

In many aspects, the presented research is a pioneer work. It raises many questions, which is always a sign of a solid discussion, despite some flaws and debatable approaches to the research design. I have to compliment the amount of work put into organizing the interviews, which brings a lot of solid research findings. The presented thesis is a reliable academic work that will be useful for many others focusing on similar topics. I recommend it for the thesis defense with a grade of B.

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

5.1	Would it be possible to use the same research design for analyzing any other cause, such as human rights advocacy, LGBTQ+, etc.?
5.2	Could You once again explain the process of selecting the research sample?
5.3	Shouldn't you add some geographical or better location-like aspects? The sample is predominantly US based.
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: August 30, 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.