

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: Tunková Anna

Thesis title: Echoes of history: Reflection of the socialist past regarding the 2023 presidential election in selected Czech media

Reviewer:

Surname and given name: Němcová Tejkalová Alice

Affiliation: Department of Journalism

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 | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <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):

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 | C |
| 2.4 | Ability to select the appropriate methods and to use them correctly | D |
| 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): I really like Literature review but I do not understand why a concept of agenda-setting was selected for a theoretic framework when reactions of the audience to the topics were not analyzed, neither the author talked with the editors about their intentions. I respect it, even though I am not persuaded. It would be enough to work with memory studies and a concept of collective memory formation and how media contribute to it.

Regarding the Methodology - if you only quantified numbers of articles referencing socialist past based on the keywords found in these articles, you have not conducted a quantitative content analysis but you have only mapped and described the quantitative distribution of articles with this topic. This influences also the soundness of presented results.

I am also interested in how the four articles from each medium were selected, what should I imagine behind words: “based on a systematic sampling approach to ensure representativeness and relevance“. How exactly did you select them?

The first, quantitative part of an analytical section is informative, I would not speculate about the editorial intentions since you in fact did not go into the texts (if I haven’t missed anything), you just generated results from Newton based on selected key words. On the other hand, I very much like the qualitative analysis but do

not know how exactly the articles were selected and would definitely go for more media texts, if the general corpus consisted of thousands of texts. Still, I can't see any reason for agenda-setting paradigm.
 Ad Discussion – why do you think „Left-leaning outlets like Alarm and Deník N emphasised these narratives more. This likely reflects their editorial priorities and desire to examine the candidates' historical ties to communism critically“? Why Echo 24 and Aktuálně weren't more interested?
 You also write there: „The qualitative analysis reveals that even outlets with lower percentages of communism-related articles, such as Echo24, produced some of the most critical coverage of the candidate's past.“ Can we summarize like that when only 24 out of more than 5,000 texts were analyzed?
 Anyway, I enjoyed reading the Discussion, just summarizing parts should belong to the Conclusion, that is particularly brief.

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 | B-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) | B |
| 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):

My indecisive grade for “Quality of argumentation” comes from different analytical quality of thesis's parts. Some are excellent, some are very good.

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

It is a very interesting thesis, written upon the important topic and extending current research, with some parts of the text being even excellent. Nevertheless, I cannot miss methodological issues with a presentation of quantitative results, and limited number of texts for qualitative analysis. Furthermore, I do not think agenda-setting is a theoretic framework fitting for any of the presented analyses. Therefore, I grade C.

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

| | |
|-----|--|
| 5.1 | What is a quantitative content media analysis? |
| 5.2 | There are more questions above in the text, please, answer them. |
| 5.3 | |
| 5.4 | |

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 | All sources are referenced. |
|-----|-----------------------------|

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

- A Excellent (excellent performance)
 B Excellent (excellent performance)
 C X 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: September 7, 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.