

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 Viking

Thesis title: Journalistic Perspectives on Nordic Identity in Estonia

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Methodology	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	Thesis structure	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):

The research objectives, methodology and structure conform to approved research proposal. The minor changes (e.g. number of interviews) are appropriately explained in the thesis.

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	B
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):

The theoretical part of the thesis provides essential information needed for understanding the phenomena. The candidate uses the relevant literature that is further applied. The (inter)connection of the theory, methods and conclusions is the biggest strength of the presented thesis. Each step of the research is properly described and justified. I appreciate the research transparency (e.g., detailed description of sampling). A slightly problematic issue might be quantification (despite the nature of qualitative research), but the candidate is aware of that and partially explains the reasons. The conclusions drawn from the research are clear. The topic of the thesis is undoubtedly original and contributes to academic knowledge in journalism and media studies.

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 (*)	B
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	B

(*) 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 structure of the thesis is understandable and logical. The conclusions are based on good argumentation. The candidate mainly uses an academic writing style but slips into a journalistic style in some passages of text. All the information are properly cited while conforming to quotation standard, although I found minor inaccuracies in reference formatting (e.g., p. 23). I have a minor complaint about the alignment of the text; in some cases, there are clauses or single-letter transpositions at the ends of the lines, and a mistake between pages 49 and 50. Also, the style of titles of the figures/tables should be unified.

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

James Viking Niiler submitted a good MA thesis, which meets all the field of study requirements. I appreciate that the candidate chose a topic related to his personal experience and origin and was able to select the appropriate method to respond to posed research questions. The presentation of findings is well-structured and convincing. Overall, it is a well-written thesis covering an interesting topic. I suggest evaluating James Viking Niiler's work by grade "A".

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

5.1	What quantitative method could possibly enrich and strengthen your findings? Why?
5.2	Would the results be different if the research is conducted ten years later? Why/why not?

6. ANTIPLAGIARISM CHECK

X The reviewer is familiar with the thesis' score in plagiarism analysis in SIS.

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

6.1	The score is 39%. The similarity was indicated mainly in generic word combinations; in my opinion, this is not problematic from the point of view of publication ethics.
-----	--

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 14, 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.