

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: McCauley Amina

Thesis title: Sources and framing: a comparison of media coverage of climate change across the world

Reviewer:

Surname and given name: Dr Neag Annamária

Affiliation: Institute of Communication Studies and 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) | <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): No major problems noted.

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

COMMENTARY (description of thesis content and the main problems): The author starts with a good and compelling introduction, that gives a clear context of the research project. The literature review is strong, with the author selecting studies that focus both on the Global North and South. Some parts of the thesis, however, are not somewhat weaker: e.g. the subchapter 'Why audience matter', is not actually about audiences, but more about journalistic norms. The literature review focusing on the media coverage is particularly relevant, but the author could have presented in more in depth how these findings influence the present study. The limitations of the study have been correctly identified. The most important of these being the amount of data for drawing overall conclusions, which the author notes. This is something that weakens the overall study. Another limitation is connected to the analysis of local contexts (e.g. to understand the reasons why for instance, Danish articles used ordinary people in such large number). A more in-depth analysis of these aspects should have been presented in order to be able to draw parallels.

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 | A |

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 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) | 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):

The dissertation is of very good quality when it comes to referencing and appropriate use of academic terminology. There were some minor grammar and style errors (e.g. on the title page and for whatever reason there is a chapter title at the end of the dissertation called 'Introduction') and some inconsistencies in the reference list.

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

This is a well-written dissertation that looks at an important aspect of the climate crisis media discourse. The literature review and theoretical framework are strong and so is the methodology. And although, there is a limit to how much one can cover in an MA dissertation, the analysis lacks some depth in order for the reader to really understand why and how these differences came about.

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

| | |
|-----|---|
| 5.1 | What is the biggest limitation of this project, in your own view? |
| 5.2 | |
| 5.3 | |
| 5.4 | |

6. ANTIPLAGIARISM CHECK

The reviewer is familiar with the thesis' antiplagiarism system score.

If the score is above 5%, please evaluate and indicate problems:

| | |
|-----|---|
| 6.1 | The result is 28%, but all found content is less than 1% in similarity. |
|-----|---|

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:30.08.2022

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.