

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: Devaraj Yoheswari

Thesis title: Comparative analysis of climate change conference coverage in India and UK newspapers: framing difference

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 generally follows 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	C
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	A
2.6	Thesis originality and its contribution to academic knowledge production	B

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

The thesis explores a seeming paradox: according to existing literature, global climate change in media around the world seems to reflect the logic of media imperialism as media in developing countries follow discourse and perspectives of media in developed countries. To test it, this thesis examines whether the media in the UK and in India cover climate change conferences in a similar or in a different way.

The literature review covers big areas of research and is not comprehensive, probably it would be better to focus closely on essential issues. In the theoretical chapter, the choice of relevant theories could be explained in detail, it would be good to have a set of arguments why these theories and not others. Similarly, in the methodological part, the link between theories and methods should be clearer and explanation why a particular approach has been chosen should be present. In principle, the author's approach makes sense, but it should be presented to the reader more explicitly.

The conclusion provides a good summary of the findings. The results are also extensively discussed and linked with relevant theories, which is a huge plus. Importantly, the research questions are meaningfully answered.

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)	C
3.5	Conformity to quotation standards (*)	E
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 thesis has a clear structure, but sometimes its content appears in a wrong place (for example, framing is discussed first in literature review and then in methodology). Sometimes, the language is too abstract and lacking substance (for example, the first sentence of the introduction). Correct terminology is used, and convincing arguments applied. There is lot of references and the author is honest about use of her sources, but parts of the text are not clearly marked as quotations. The other formal aspects seem to be fine.

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

The thesis reaches its goals and uses appropriate methods to answer timely and relevant questions. The connections between theories, methods, and data should have been explained more explicitly. The analysis itself and the conclusions are clear and easy to follow. There are also some moderately important formal issues.

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

5.1	Could you explain the logic for choosing two different dailies in both countries? How useful was this design?
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	The antiplagiarism software shows a shocking 46 % score. The highlighted parts of the thesis text are usually clearly attributed to their sources by the author, but quotation marks are sometimes missing. Overall, the high score is mainly created by a table in an appendix with quotations from the analysed articles.
-----	---

6. 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 13, 2023

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.