

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: Tereza Krátká

Thesis title: User behavior and motivations on social media platform BeReal

Reviewer:

Surname and given name: Christine Trültzsch-Wijnen

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) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.2 | Methodology | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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):

Overall, the thesis conforms to the approved research proposal.

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 | C |
| 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 | B |

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

The thesis includes actual literature and the research questions are based on a sound theoretical framework. The author shows her ability of critically discussing and reflecting different sources of literature. The study draws on a small previous quantitative pilot study (as seminar paper) that gave first insights into the research topic (the platform BeReal) and partly also served as a sampling tool for the second study. On this basis new research questions for a new qualitative in-depth study were created. Hence, the methodological focus of this thesis is on a qualitative design with semi-structured interviews. In her description of the methodology the author blurs the borders between the previous quantitative pilot study and the study which is in the centre of the master thesis. For readers who do not understand this difference it is difficult to follow the description of the methodology (e.g. the author is talking about a multi method design but at the end the focus of the thesis is only on the qualitative data). A qualitative study does not per se need hypothesis but detailed research questions and sub questions. In this thesis the research questions are sound and well explained, but the hypothesis should rather have been formulated as questions, as well. But still, the research questions as well as the ‘hypothesis’ are well guiding the empirical study and they are answered in a good way in the findings section. But even if the description of the research design is weak, the author shows that she is able to select appropriate methods for data collection (semi-structured interviews) and data analysis (thematic coding) and that she is using them in a correct way. The conclusion as well as the discussion of the data is rather short and

could go more into detail. Although there exists a large body of research in the field of social network sites, this thesis is a good new contribution to this research field as there is still not much research on the platform BeReal.

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 | A |
| 3.3 | Appropriate use of academic terminology | A |
| 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 form of the thesis conforms the overall rules for academic writing.

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

See also my commentary on the content.

It is a good thesis which is difficult to evaluate. The author shows that she is able to work with academic literature and to critically discuss and reflect it. She also shows that she is able to conduct a qualitative study and to work appropriately with the methods chosen. Also, the argumentation is good and keeps the logic of the research questions from the beginning until the end. But at the same time the thesis shows significant weakness in the description of the methodology because there is no clear division between a small quantitative pilot study that also served as first screening for interview partners and as a tool to focus the research question of the follow-up in-depth qualitative study. There is a need for a better description of the quantitative study and how it is related to the qualitative study.

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

| | |
|-----|--|
| 5.1 | The uses and gratifications approach guided your research. Would there also be other approaches that could have grounded your study? – And how do they relate to the U&G approach? |
| 5.2 | Does your study offer any perspectives or recommendations for future research? |
| 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 | |
|-----|--|

6. 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.