

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: Gasnier Camille

Thesis title: Impact of AI-Generated Images in the Work Field of Journalism

Reviewer:

Surname and given name: Miessler Jan

Affiliation: KMS 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)	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<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 thesis conforms to the research proposal. Research questions were slightly adjusted (see p. 23).

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	D
2.2	Ability to critically evaluate and apply the literature	C
2.3	Quality and soundness of the empirical research	D
2.4	Ability to select the appropriate methods and to use them correctly	D
2.5	Quality of the conclusion	E
2.6	Thesis originality and its contribution to academic knowledge production	C

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

Recently, texts and images generated by artificial intelligence emerged as a phenomenon changing many fields of human activity. This revised version of the thesis looks into impact of AI-generated images on (photo-)journalism by interviewing seven French-speaking journalists and presenting a summary of their views. The topic is new and relevant, and the thesis has a potential to contribute to the research field.

Although AI-generated images and their widespread use is a recent phenomenon, it would be still possible to grasp it with reference to existing, established media theories, or at least confront the phenomenon with theories that should be relevant or are considered relevant. However, the literature review and theoretical chapters seem like a collection of somewhat random references. The theoretical part does not really discuss any particular theories. For the topics discussed, it would be possible to reference theoretically relevant works, and for works used to support various different claims, it would be helpful to provide page numbers.

Related problem is that while the thesis asking WHETHER the AI has impact on journalism, the whole literature review chapter is about what impact does it have. If there is a consensus about the impact, why using only this literature in a thesis that may question precisely this assumption without being explicitly critical about this literature?

Research questions (p. 23) are not explicitly linked to theories. They are presented after the questions given to the interviewed journalists during semi-structured interviews in a confusing way and without explanation of the relationship between the research questions and interview questions. Only selected statements are presented in the thesis, e.g. no full transcripts of the The fact that there was a diversity with at least some issues (p. 45), including the perceived impact of the AI, is weakened by the fact that it is all based on just seven interviews, and the respondents may easily miss something important, which the author acknowledges (p. 48).

The key conclusions are actually present in the discussion chapter while the conclusion contains mainly statements about the impact of AI in general. The language suggests “objective” results even though it is just based on the statements of seven French journalists.

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	D
3.3	Appropriate use of academic terminology	C
3.4	Quality, quantity and appropriateness of the citations (both in the theory part and in the empirical part)	E
3.5	Conformity to quotation standards (*)	B
3.6	Use of an academic writing style, and correct use of language (both grammar and spelling)	D
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):

In general, the thesis structure is clear, but some key information is in fact not in the appropriate chapter and some seems to be missing. Namely the argumentation about relevance of certain theoretical concepts, perspectives etc. and links between the theoretical, methodological and empirical parts are hard to find.

It has been already mentioned that in-text references are consistently missing page, making it impossible to verify how the author actually works with the literature.

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

The thesis explores relevant and timely topic. It identifies the key challenges caused by the AI and limitations of the research, but there are some serious problems in the theoretical, methodological and analytical parts.

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

5.1	How theoretically relevant are the research questions? To which literature are they related?
5.2	The interview questions were formulated based on what?
5.3	Was there any real diversity of opinion, or was there a widespread consensus about AI impact on journalism, and how strongly?

6. ANTIPLAGIARISM CHECK

The reviewer is familiar with the thesis‘ URKUND score.

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** excellent
- B** very good (above average but with some weaknesses)
- C** good (average with some important weaknesses)
- D** satisfactory (below average with significant weaknesses)
- E** marginal pass (meeting minimal requirements)
- F** not recommended for defence

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

Date: June 6, 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.