

**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: Niiler, James

**Thesis title:** Journalistic Perspective on Nordic Identity in Estonia

**Reviewer:**

Surname and given name: Shavit, Anna

Affiliation: ICSJ 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 the approved research proposal
1.1	Research objective(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Methodology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	Thesis structure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	<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):

**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	A
2.4	Ability to select the appropriate methods and to use them correctly	A
2.5	Quality of the conclusion	A
2.6	Thesis originality and its contribution to academic knowledge production	A

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

James chose a rather subtle theme, which is very often perceived in a traditional or rather emotional way. I appreciate that he has clearly articulated his research objectives and reframed an extremely abstract topic into straightforward research questions. The work is extensive and yields interesting findings. The interviews clarify a large part of the issues. The text is well structured, and the results are presented in a clear and valuable form. The author has thus managed to escape the "trap" of self-affirming "given truths" and, in turn, tends to look at the issue of self-perception in Estonia, to look at it from a distance

**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 whole thesis is very clearly prepared, and I have no reservations about it. The entire project had a long-term development and changed a lot during the writing process. However, the writer looked for answers and avoided "confirming" his views, instead asking questions and correcting his assumptions based on the information he received.

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

**The thesis has an excellent theoretical introduction, a clearly formulated research design. The analytical part is clear and understandable. The answers obtained are well presented, and all the findings are then clearly summarized in the conclusion. This is a very well written thesis.**

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

5.1	After the thesis completion and answering the main research questions. Based on the results would you change the initial viewpoint or would you do something differently?
5.2	
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	
-----	--

**7. SUGGESTED GRADE OF THE THESIS AS A WHOLE** (choose one or two)

A                      
 B                      
 C                      
 D                      
 E                      
 F                   

**If the mark is an "F", please provide your reasons for not recommending the thesis for defence:**

--

Date: June 12, 2023

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.*