

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: Renay Golden Serena

Thesis title: Marketing “That Girl” and the commodification of perfect womanhood on TikTok

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<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 and thesis structure are in line with the submitted proposal. The candidate decided to change the method of the analysis, and she stated the reasons for doing so 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	C
2.2	Ability to critically evaluate and apply the literature	C
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 candidate uses a wide amount of literature sources, but they can be better combined altogether, especially in the Introduction and Literature Review (there is often a passage based on one source followed by the passage built up on a second source and so on). The candidate is able to evaluate and apply the literature critically. Still, there is evidence of opinion leaning towards certain theories with which the author is in agreement and that are not necessarily very relevant to the subject of the research. (This would not be problematic if it was stated in the Introduction or Limitations and Ethical Concerns, but it was not - there was potential bias mentioned but not the specific kind of potential bias, though.) The candidate was able to conduct the analysis, but although there is a noticeable effort to describe each step of the research process, the overall impression of the methodological chapter is not convincing, which may be caused by the "last minute" change of method and inability to present the chosen approach in a structured and confident way. The presentation of the results is highly descriptive, and the percentages in the graphs can be misleading (due to the relatively low number of analyzed units). The conclusions are sufficient but highly repetitive. The thesis topic is valuable, and the phenomena are worth studying in the context of media and communication 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	C
3.2	Quality of the argumentation	C
3.3	Appropriate use of academic terminology	B
3.4	Quality, quantity and appropriateness of the citations (both in the theory part and in the empirical part)	B
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	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 structure of the thesis is logical; however, some chapters seem too general and could be better structured. Textual lay-outing is on the average level, but the text could be better edited (e.g., single-letter prepositions and articles remained at the ends of the lines, and the alignment of the text seems a bit scattered). The text is written in the academic style and conforms to the quotation standards (the only exceptions are figures and graphs, where the sources are not explicitly stated). The Contents (Table of Contents) is written in blue colour that is not used anywhere else in the thesis.

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

The diploma thesis of Serena Renay Golden definitely deserves to be defended, as it fulfils all the necessary criteria. On the other hand, some passages could be better structured, and the interpretation of the results could be more developed, as well as the concluding remarks. Due to the aforementioned facts, I suggest the evaluation by grade C.

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

5.1	Why did you decide to change the method? What were the main advantage(s)/disadvantage(s) of this step?
5.2	How exactly did you define the categories for coding? (Why did not you code "breakfast" as "meal"?)

6. ANTIPLAGIARISM CHECK

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 overall similarity is 14%, and it is indicated mainly in the thesis template and direct quotations. The thesis conforms to the academic standards in this manner.
-----	---

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:23/08/2023

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.