

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: Torsello Vittoria

Thesis title: The reproduction of structural power through discourses of delegitimation. The portrayal of the climate crisis in Italian newspapers

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 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): There were only minor changes introduced.

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	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	B

COMMENTARY (description of thesis content and the main problems): This is an interesting dissertation that tackles an urgent topic, focusing on how the media frames the climate crisis in Italy. The author has a broad overview of the topic and she has obviously invested a lot of time and energy in carrying out the research. The theoretical framework is particularly strong, showcasing the author's knowledge. However, and perhaps for this reason exactly, sometimes the ideas that the author wants to convey are difficult to follow (e.g. introductory paragraph p.19). Similarly, the main research question seems somewhat unfocused or convoluted. Although at one point the author does mention that she believes in an activist academic position, this should have been explained more thoroughly and early on in the dissertation. As it stands, the author's own stand toward the issue under investigation seems biased and it makes the coding of Draghi's statements as greenwashing, complicated. In terms of methodology, the author should have presented more in detail why those newspapers and combination of keywords were selected.

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	C
3.2	Quality of the argumentation	B
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	C

(*) 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):

Although the thesis presents interesting findings, the structure of the dissertation makes it less reader-friendly. The large number of sub-chapters and the lack of figure explanations diminish the value of the empirical research. There are some grammar and style errors, and also issues when quoting the articles analysed. It is also unclear why the 'Organisation of the thesis' was placed under the chapter called 'Theory'. In terms of argumentation, some ideas are presented multiple times (e.g. the overrepresentation of the political elite's views in news media).

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

The strongest part of the dissertation is the theoretical framework as it shows the overall knowledge and interest of the author in the works of the scholars used. However, the length and sometimes the cumbersome argumentation makes it difficult to read. The empirical research is thorough, but again, the way it is presented (also the issue of figures, see above) makes it less compelling.

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

5.1	Can you explain how you selected the news outlets and the keywords?
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 score is above 5%, but there are no issued of plagiarism noted.
-----	---

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:02.09.2022

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.

