

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: Kaae Merved August

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

Reviewer:

Surname and given name: Turková Kateřina

Affiliation: KŽ 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 structure conform to the research proposal. The methodology was slightly changed (the candidate gave more emphasis on the quantitative method and reformulated the research questions), but the shift is understandable and well explained..

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	B
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):

The candidate used the appropriate theoretical framework while using the relevant type and amount of literature. Regarding empirical research, the strongest parts are the description of the methodological approach (although this part is way too technical in some passages) and the reflection of what can and cannot be interpreted from the results. The presentation of quantitative data could be more convincing, and there were not sources of data stated under the graphs (but it is evident that the data came from the author's own research). However, the candidate was able to sum all the knowledge up in the end. The topic of the thesis is original and significantly contributes to academic knowledge in the media and communication 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	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)	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 logical and understandable, as well as the candidate's argumentation. The academic terminology is used correctly in the text, and the language in the thesis is also correct, except the small mistakes (e.g., in punctuation - even in the title of the chapter). There are minor mistakes in textual lay-outing (e.g., the chapters that should not be numbered are numbered, single letter clauses are at the ends of the lines), but the thesis is properly edited overall. I appreciate putting the transcripts (and translated versions) and the links to the analyzed articles into the Appendix. The referencing conforms to the quotation standards.

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

August Kaae Merved submitted a high-quality thesis in which he proved the ability to conduct sound research, present its findings, and provide conclusions. The selected topic is important in the current global context. Despite the minor mistakes mentioned above, the text fulfills all the criteria of a very good master thesis, which is the reason why I suggest to evaluate it by grade A.

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

5.1	While considering the news values concept, are your results surprising? Why/Why not?
5.2	If you decide to continue researching the topic, what would be the next steps/directions?

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 overall similarity due to Turnitin is 6%. The similarity is indicated mostly in the thesis structure or direct quotations, which is not problematic.
-----	--

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: 27/08/2023

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.