

**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: Joshi, Kirti

**Thesis title:** Journalistic Branding Behaviour on Social Media: Do Indian political journalists create a brand online?

**Reviewer:**

Surname and given name: Shavit, Anna

Affiliation: MKPR 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 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): There are no problems 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	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	B
2.6	Thesis originality and its contribution to academic knowledge production	A

COMMENTARY (description of thesis content and the main problems): The presented thesis is, first of all, very original academic work and is a pioneering study in many aspects. The author is mapping and analyzing how Indian journalists use social media to support their job, medium, or create their brand. The empirical part of the thesis is very well rooted in the theoretical background. The author very skilfully works with a theoretical framework and later builds on the methodological part. The research goals and questions are logical, and the research sample is well selected. The author clearly understands the Indian media environment. The writing is very bright; however, I have to use the word sloppy repeatedly. The work is outstanding, but it misses more focus to be brilliant. I would recommend a better direction in the empirical part and especially in the conclusions when the research questions are being answered. It seems the author expects that reader has the same level of expertise. Here it would fit to be a bit better in organizing the structure of presenting the findings and conclusions.

**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	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)	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 (description of thesis form and the main problems):  
 The presented thesis is very well structured and written. The author understands her topic and is skillful in providing insight into the Indian media market. The selected sample represents the Indian media scene; however, it would be good to explain the sample selection method during the defense.  
 The academic writing style is excellent and fulfills other academic standards.

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

**The overall evaluation here is that Kirti Joshi is presenting a very solid piece of academic work. She picked a timely and fascinating topic. The research approach is substantial, and the writing is excellent. It is just missing a bit more detailed process to be called superb work. I am delighted to recommend her thesis for defense with a grade of B.**

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

5.1	Can you explain the sample selection process in more extensive detail?
5.2	
5.3	
5.4	

**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: September 4, 2022

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.*