

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: Němcová Tejkalová Alice

Affiliation: ICSJ

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 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):

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	B
2.3	Quality and soundness of the empirical research	B
2.4	Ability to select the appropriate methods and to use them correctly	C
2.5	Quality of the conclusion	C
2.6	Thesis originality and its contribution to academic knowledge production	B

COMMENTARY (description of thesis content and the main problems): There should be a qualitative research used in the thesis. Therefore, I do not understand why the research questions "are based on hypotheses". Because of a slightly chaotic structure of a thesis, I was not able to understand exactly how the methods were implemented. Because it should be the analysis of the discourse, based on the analysis of texts, I cannot see how it can answer the RQ that is focused on the relationship of the elite actors and journalists. A thesis can speculate about this relationship but without conducting the interviews it is impossible to say how is the relationship. I would much more work with a literature review from the beginning in the part named Discussion of the findings and the findings in general are not so surprising and different from the experience and analyses from other Western countries (with the exception of e.g. Nordic countries).

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	D

3.2	Quality of the argumentation	B
3.3	Appropriate use of academic terminology	B
3.4	Quality, quantity and appropriateness of the citations (both in the theory part and in the empirical part)	B
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):

I would appreciate, especially in the case of such a long and complexed thesis to learn in the Introduction what the thesis is about, how it is structured, what are the main research questions, etc. It would definitely helped the reader to cope better with the first theoretical part and follow the author's ideas. There is only a brief part Organization of a thesis, mainly about the structure illogically at the beginning of Theory. A part Purpose and importance of the study is hidden among theoretical concepts, again without any explained purpose. As a surprises, again without visible reason come at the end of the part about discourse, ideology, etc. the chapters Synopsis of the theoretical framework and Research questions and hypothesis. For the better understanding of the results a legend at each graph should be presented. And the presentation of the example of code book as the appendix would be welcomed.

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

In general, it is a very interesting thesis developing an important topic, bringing both well known and new insights. But it has a complicated structure that could definitely be simplified, a visual model of codes/categories would be extremely helpful for the readers.

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

5.1	Is there any difference how the climate change has been framed in the USA, Italy and the Czech Republic in past couple of years?
5.2	Is there a chance that media will take climate change seriously but without sensations, in the next years?
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	Sources are referenced in the text.
-----	-------------------------------------

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: 4th September 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.