

**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: Chen, Chih Yun

**Thesis title:** Words of War on Triangular Relations: A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Cross-Strait Relations in Official Statements of Taiwan, China and the U.S. during Nancy Pelosi's visit to Taiwan in August 2022

**Reviewer:**

Surname and given name: Dağdelen, Mazlum Kemal

Affiliation: Institute of Communication Studies and Journalism (ICSJ), Faculty of Social Sciences (FSS)

**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 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):

The thesis complies with the proposed objectives and methodology. The thesis structure has slightly changed (i.e. the title, the order of sections) in agreement with the supervisor. The author clarifies and justifies the implemented changes, and these changes contribute well to the overall quality of 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	B
2.2	Ability to critically evaluate and apply the literature	C
2.3	Quality and soundness of the empirical research	B
2.4	Ability to select the appropriate methods and to use them correctly	B
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 author utilises a theoretical framework which fits well to the selected methodology and the research objectives. The author provides an appropriate overview of the complex theories and brings them in line with the relevant literature, and provides support with the contextual background. The methodology is well chosen, and well implemented, this further contributes to the quality and soundness of the empirical research. In analysing the selected data, the author provides more room for description than actual analysis, this could have been better balanced. The conclusion provides a final overview of the research but there could have been more emphasis on the particularity of the research and its unique findings. The selected topic is important considering the current landscape in the selected context, and has potential to contribute to the broader body of knowledge. Overall, the content of the thesis satisfactorily meets the academic expectations.

**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	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 (*)	C
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 thesis is well-structured and easy to navigate. The author uses academic terminology appropriately, and conforms to the quotation standards. The academic writing style is followed to the standard. The author could have been more creative in handling the quotations, especially in the findings and analysis chapters. Although the analysis is systematic enough, the presentation of the analysis includes plenty of long block quotations, which feels too descriptive from time to time.

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

Cheh Chih Yun’s thesis meets the academic standards and provides important important findings, considering the complexities of the selected context. The systematic analysis is satisfactory even though there is still room for improvement in the presentation of the analysis. The methodology and the research design have been clarified, however, the actual implementation of CDA could have been elaborated more. After thorough analysis of the thesis, my suggestion is to evaluate the thesis with grade “B” or “C”.

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

5.1	Please elaborate a bit more on why you selected Fairclough’s CDA and not one of the other analytical methods using discourse theory and how it helped you meet your research objectives.
5.2	Please reflect on the potential contributions of your research project within the literature of academic studies that you analysed in your literature review.

**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 outcome of the Turnitin similarity check is 32%. An in-depth evaluation of this automatically generated Turnitin report demonstrates that most of the reported similarities come from the thesis template and the block quotes. The author conforms to the quotation standards, and thus this thesis could be defended.
-----	---

**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:09 September 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.*