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 x
Thesis author:
        Surname and given name: Alves Faria Giovana
Thesis title: Tik Tok News: An analysis of users' perception of journalistic content on Tik Tok
Reviewer:
        Surname and given name: Turková Kateřina
        Affiliation: IKSŽ 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)	x	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.2	Methodology	☐	x	☐	☐	☐
1.3	Thesis structure	☐	x	☐	☐	☐

COMMENTARY (description of the relationship between the research proposal and the thesis. If there are problems, please be specific):
The research objectives conforms to approved research proposals. There are changes in the methodology (e.g. narrowing the research sample) as well as the structure of the thesis, and I think they made the research more feasible.

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

COMMENTARY (description of thesis content and the main problems):
The author uses the appropriate amount and type of sources that allows her to present a well-developed theoretical part. The student can also critically evaluate and apply the literature in the theoretical part. On the other hand, I find the empirical part, especially the application and interpretation of the results of quantitative content analysis, slightly problematic. Some quantitative elements are evident in the argumentation, but other findings within this part are also based on the qualitative aspects.
The author is able to draw conclusions from the conducted research and present them in an acceptable way. The topic of the thesis is original and contributes to the current body of research in the media studies field.

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	B
3.3	Appropriate use of academic terminology	C
3.4	Quality, quantity and appropriateness of the citations (both in the theory part and in the empirical part)	C

3.5	Conformity to quotation standards (*)	D
3.6	Use of an academic writing style, and correct use of language (both grammar and spelling)	D
3.6	Quality of the textual lay-outing and appendices	C

(*) 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 has a standard recommended structure. Some information in the methodological parts could be presented as part of the theory, but this is not a major problem. The candidate shows that she is able to present her thoughts and findings in a proper way. If it is necessary, she clearly defines how she understands and uses the concrete term or paradigm. Regarding the academic terminology, it is applied correctly in most cases, but there are also substantial mistakes, e.g. spelling some key terms.
The author cites the sources of the information, but not always in the proper format (there are mentioned names in case of more than two authors instead of "et al."; sometimes commas are missing…). The writing style is not always academic, while the student tends to use the journalistic style, including expressive word combinations). The text is not fully correct in terms of grammar and spelling.
The textual lay-outing of the thesis is average; there are mistakes in formatting (e,g. some headings are located on the other page than the text, different text alignment and indentation, different colors in text).

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

The submitted master thesis provides solid insight into the users' perception of journalistic content on Tik Tok. The topic of the thesis is original.
Due to the weaknesses related to both content and formal requirements, I recommend evaluating this master thesis by the mark "C".

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

5.1	The author declares that she used the purposive (not "purposeful") sampling method for the respondents´ selection. Would it be possible to describe this procedure more in-depth? From the final selection, I assume that there were more criteria than those briefly described in the methodological/research part.
5.2	As I have some complaints about QCA (see above), would it be possible to describe the coding process again? (It would also be beneficial to even see your coding sheet(s); hence I did not find them in the thesis/appendices.)

6. ANTIPLAGIARISM CHECK

x The reviewer is familiar with the thesis' URKUND score.

If the score is above 5%, please evaluate and indicate problems:

6.1	The overall similarity indicated by SIS (Turnitin) is 20 %. The similarity was identified mainly in the direct quotations, diploma thesis template and general phrases. I did not identify any significant problem related to the plagiarism.

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	x	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: 7. 8. 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.