

Bachelor's thesis review

Thesis title: Facebook use and social comparison, envy and self-esteem

Author: Klara Debeljak

Opponent: Doc. PhDr. Gabriela Seidlová Málková, Ph.D.

This thesis seems to explore the possible relationship of selected social psychological mechanisms and well-being of Facebook users. It has to be mentioned that any aim of this thesis is identified at the beginning parts of the text. So it was a bit difficult for me to comprehend the structure and the purpose of the study the author conducted. Anyway, this thesis seems to be conducted as a review, the purpose of the review, however, is not clearly expressed. The author probably builds up the text upon her "personal belief" (p.9.) of negative impact of selected Facebook mechanisms (social comparison and envy) to the Facebook users. I could appraise the author's personal interest in selected psychological aspects of Facebook using, however it is difficult to accept this interest as a sufficient justification of the relevance of the bachelor theses (academic writing) topic.

Bachelor theses should be written as a research report or research paper (at least an attempt of). It always helps if the thesis is clearly tight to a certain discipline (in our case some of the social sciences/humanities disciplines) and gets the inspiration from already existing research on how various types of research are done and what methods to conduct research are implemented within a particular discipline. In case of this thesis I am not sure what kind of text I am reading and how to understand the "personal overview" within the forms of academic writing. What is more, I do not realize any clear structure and development in the text. The text is rather episodic, chaotic and badly structured -from the first sight into the Table of contents: for example: What is a part one if there is a Part two on page 25? Where is the end of Part two? How it comes there are three (or two?) Introduction chapters in the text? How could a systematic review contain another systematic review – p. 25 and p. 27? ... Generally speaking the text of this thesis could probably be more coherent without its first parts, esp. the chapter Network society.

From the methodological point of view it is not clear what is meant by "systematic review", what this notion refers to. It seems to me that the author planned to adopt and use certain procedure to conduct a review (p. 34 cited Meline (2006)), however this procedure is not identified, described and explained to enable the reader to understand its purpose and use within the text. For that reason also "standards for inclusion and exclusion" described on p. 34 do not make any sense and seem to be totally made up with no theory behind.

Probably the most valuable part of the text is the chapter "Results" actually containing results of the literature search (not the thesis results). It is however a pity that there is just a brief description of a content of each of the resulting sources and no analytical work (rooted in any system or purpose) used on it. Each paper seems to be described with a different structure: sometimes only aim of the study and its results are mentioned, sometimes also methodology and design or discussion points. So it is difficult for the reader to understand what the author is after... and also how (based on what) was the concluding paragraph of the chapter Discussion (page 56) and the whole chapter Conclusion developed.

The thesis is generally well written, although signalling less attention paid to a final proofreading and to the proper referencing in the text. The weaknesses of this thesis lies in the lack of research question

(or question for the review) development, no clear methodology description and application and poor (actually lack of) analytical work in the text.

I consider this thesis to be borderline acceptable for the defence procedure. I would recommend the author a careful preparation for the defence speech to present the theses in more structured, comprehensible and thoughtful way. I propose the grading as borderline good.

Gabriela Seidlová Málková

4. 9. 2018