Master's Thesis Evaluation Form

Student's name:
Phoo Pyae Pyae Soe

Thesis title:
Media Bias and Framing Analysis of Local Media and Foreign Based Media coverage on the case of " Rohingya: Gambia files case against Myanmar at International Court of Justice"

Name of the supervisor:
Mgr. Anna Shavit, Ph.D.

Name of the opponent:
PhDr. Lenka Vochocová, Ph.D.

What are the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis? Please give your reasons for the suggested grade in detail below.

1.   Does the author show understanding of one or more theories, and use theory to generate a hypothesis or to make the problem area more understandable.

The author presents a very mature scientific work based on the framing theory and its use in a comparative study from the field of political communication. The author uses the framing theory to prepare a complex scientific project anchored in both theory and original data. My only concern would be that in some of the expressions the author simplifies the framing theory a little bit – she perceives framing too much as an intention on the side of the journalists ("… mass media creates the frames to highlight the certain points in their content with the aim to influence the audience's thought"; "Through framing the event from a certain aspect of an issue, the media tells the audience what and how to think, thereby influencing the decision making process of the people.") and also exaggerates the media effects in some sentences ("Indeed, media agencies completely regulate the framing of the event or issue by constructing the news with an angle that they want the audience to enthuse.") – these expressions then contrast with (a correct) explanation of how framing involves the communicator, the receiver, the context and the culture.

2.   Is the research question articulated clearly and properly? Is the research question sufficiently answered in the conclusion?

Comments: Yes, the author presents the research questions very clearly and answers them in detail and even offers some (basic) interpretations.

3.   Is the thesis based on relevant research and literature and does it accurately summarize and integrate the information?

Comments: Yes, even the methodological part of the study is very well sourced and relates to previous research.

Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences
Institute of Sociological Studies, Department of Sociology
Pekařská 641/16, 155 00 Prague 5 / iss.fsv.cuni.cz / jana.vojanova@fsv.cuni.cz / +420 778 465 054

www.fsv.cuni.cz
1/3

4. What is the quality of the data or the other sources? Are the sample method, data collection and data analysis appropriate?

Comments: The author presents a quality research design and summary, the method is appropriate, the author mentions limits of the study and even involved another coder in the data coding to be able to test the intercoder reliability.

5. Are the findings relevant to the research question? Are the conclusions of the thesis based on strong arguments?

Comments: Yes, the conclusions are based on arguments and anchored in the analysed data, the finding presented in the research part of the thesis are relevant and answer all the research questions clearly. The author could have provided more interpretations related to framing theory and aimed at helping the reader understand the results better. However, I still consider the thesis outstanding and believe that the author put a lot of effort in the research project.

6. Are the author's thoughts distinguished unambiguously from the borrowed ideas?

Comments: Yes, the author always refers to external thoughts in a correct scientific style.

7. Is the thesis containing original/innovative research (in terms of topic, approach, and/or findings)?

Comments: Yes, the thesis is based on an original research. It probably isn't very innovative in terms of the approach employed but I do not consider it a limit of the study. Quite the contrary, the author develops a solid research based on a very well established theory and approach.

8. What is the quality of style and other formal requirements?

Comments: The language reflects the fact that the author is not a native speaker in English, however, the quality of the text is standard. There are sometimes incomplete sentences in the thesis, a few confusing expressions (such as a repeated occurrence of the expression "ethics minorities" instead of "ethnic minorities", "farming" instead of "framing" – but these are probably caused by the automated corrections which the author simply overlooked. Other minor imperfections are missing words, incomplete phrases or incomprehensible phrases (not so often).

9. Are there any other strengths and weaknesses of the thesis, which are not included in the previous questions? Please list them if any.

Comments:

10. What topic do you suggest for the discussion in the thesis defence?

Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences
Institute of Sociological Studies, Department of Sociology
Pekařská 641/16, 155 00 Prague 5 / iss.fsv.cuni.cz / jana.vojanova@fsv.cuni.cz / +420 778 465 054

www.fsv.cuni.cz
2/3

Comments: I would like to hear how the author understands her research results in relation to the existing research and theory.

11.   *Declaration that the supervisor has read the result of the originality check in the system: [   ]   Theses   [   ]   Turnitin   [   ]   Original   (Urkund)*

Supervisor's comment on the originality check result: The Urkund system shows an 8% similarity with other documents, however, the percentage seems to capture mainly similarities in references and quoted (referenced) sources.

Overall assessment of the thesis:
I recommend the thesis for a defence as I consider it a very good, above-average, coherent research project which contributes to the field of political communication and represents a good example of the application of the framing theory (and methodology).

(Please, state clearly whether the thesis is or is not recommended for a defence and write the main reasons for the recommendation).

Proposed grade: A

(A- B: excellent, C-D: very good, E: good, F: fail)

Date: September 9, 2021   Signature:

Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences
Institute of Sociological Studies, Department of Sociology
Pekařská 641/16, 155 00 Prague 5 / iss.fsv.cuni.cz / jana.vojanova@fsv.cuni.cz / +420 778 465 054

www.fsv.cuni.cz
3/3