

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: IP Hon Leung Kenneth

Thesis title: Through an Outsider's Lens: Donald Trump in Hong Kong Media's News

Reviewer:

Surname and given name: MIESSLER Jan

Affiliation: KMS IKSZ 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)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Methodology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	Thesis structure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTARY: The thesis is consistent with the research proposal.

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	B
2.2	Ability to critically evaluate and apply the literature	C
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	B

COMMENTARY:

During the last Hong Kong protests, the then US president Donald Trump became an improbable and contradictory hero of some of the protestors given the fact that he has been seen as the leader of China's main global adversary but also as a politician capable of being dangerously friendly to China, claiming he can do profitable deals with his Chinese counterparts. The thesis uses this as a starting point to analyze Trump's discursive portrayal in Hong Kong media of different political leanings. The conclusion that these political ties correlated with differences in writing about Trump is unsurprising but well-supported.

The thesis has both strengths and weaknesses. The text sometimes does not really fit the structure as the reader sometimes finds particular things in surprising places, and sometimes they are simply missing. For example, the literature review is probably somehow present in the introduction and the explanations of some choices, e.g. why to use framing analysis, does not seem to have been written at all. On the other hand, the analysis, presentation of findings and discussion are very good.

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	B
3.2	Quality of the argumentation	C
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)	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:

There are no substantial formal problems except for the text and the formal structure being sometimes at odds and some missing explanations.

4. OVERALL EVALUATION:

The thesis has both strong and weak points. On one hand, the text and the thesis structures sometimes do not match, and some potentially helpful parts are missing which makes the thesis less convincing. On the other hand, the actual analysis is well executed and the results and their discussion is relevant.

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	The system detected only properly quoted parts.
-----	---

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

- A** Excellent (excellent performance)
B Excellent (excellent performance)
C Very Good (above the average standard but with some errors)
D Very Good (above the average standard but with some errors)
E Good (generally sound work with a number of notable errors)
F Fail (unsatisfactory performance)

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

--

Date: 12. 9. 2024

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.