

**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: Merved Kaae, August

**Thesis title:** Anonymous Private Party Funding in Denmark: How do journalists cover this issue?

**Reviewer:**

Surname and given name:

Affiliation:

**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) | <input type="checkbox"/>               | <input type="checkbox"/>                   | <input type="checkbox"/>                    | <input type="checkbox"/>                        | <input type="checkbox"/>                       |
| 1.2 | Methodology           | <input type="checkbox"/>               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>        | <input type="checkbox"/>                    | <input type="checkbox"/>                        | <input type="checkbox"/>                       |
| 1.3 | Thesis structure      | <input type="checkbox"/>               | <input checked="" 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): There are changes in the thesis structure and partly methodology, and the author reformulated the research questions. The changes are logical and completely understandable.

**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  | B     |
| 2.6 | Thesis originality and its contribution to academic knowledge production | A     |

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

Denmark is often regarded as one of the great ideals of democracy and, in particular, as a country where corruption is virtually non-existent. That is also why I appreciate August Kaae Merved has chosen topic. He examines the 'financial clubs' parties can create to finance election campaigns. The author of the work then asks fascinating questions and tries to find out, in essence, how it is possible that this does not alarm the public and how it is possible that this situation persists despite criticism, even from international organizations.

He must have managed to investigate the subject independently and has yet not to slip into a moralistic plane where you present opinions without further research. On the contrary, he explores, he asks questions. Shows very strong independent thinking and initiative.

**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 present thesis is a quality completion of the master's study. It is a solid academic work. It was a process that was not always easy, and the author himself had to rework, rethink, and change a lot during the writing process. The resulting text proves that it is still possible to look at "clearly given topics" differently and that it is good to keep asking questions.

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

**The text is a highly original contribution to the research on how corruption and political party financing are written about. It is also an interesting insight into the work of Danish journalists and their perception of their work. The author also uses fascinating comparisons with other subjects (the world football championship and others).**

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

|     |  |
|-----|--|
| 5.1 |  |
| 5.2 |  |
| 5.3 |  |
| 5.4 |  |

**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 |  |
|-----|--|

**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: August 15, 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.*