

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 x

Thesis author:

Surname and given name: Boyd-Madsen Louis

Thesis title: The Ecological Impacts of the Decline of Local Media: Climate Action, Perceptions of Climate Tractability, and Media Consumption in Scotland

Reviewer:

Surname and given name: Turková Kateřina

Affiliation: 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 type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Methodology	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	Thesis structure	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<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 candidate decided to apply the quantitative approach instead of the mixed method approach, which is understandable, and it is clearly evaluated in the thesis. Due to that, also research objectives and thesis structure differ from the original plan, but I see it as manageable because all the changes (incl. the use of different literature) are properly described.

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	B
2.5	Quality of the conclusion	C
2.6	Thesis originality and its contribution to academic knowledge production	A

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

The theoretical framework, as well as the application of the literature, are solid. The methodology and empirical research is clearly defined and transparently described, as well as the limitations and differences from the original plan, which I appreciate. The work with data is on a reasonable level, and the candidate was able to interpret the results sufficiently without major mistakes. On the other hand, I think the conclusion could get more space and be better presented in terms of argumentation and stylistics. The thesis is an original and valuable piece of research within the media and communication field.

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	B
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 (*)	C
3.6	Use of an academic writing style, and correct use of language (both grammar and spelling)	C
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):

The structure of the thesis is logical; however, some chapters are disproportional compared to others (e.g., very long Introduction - some parts could be easily incorporated into the Literature Review or/and Methodology). The candidate demonstrates the ability to use academic terminology; his argumentation is sound (although in some passages the thoughts and claims could be sorted and clustered better). In my opinion, it is not necessary to have the introduction to every subchapter, but this is an opinion of taste. The textual lay-outing of the thesis could be more precise; it is on the average level (e.g., there are single-letter prepositions and conjunctions at the ends of lines, missing interpunctuations, and some chapters as Introduction should not be numbered). The thesis is readable, but some passages are written more in the common language than in academic style. The thesis conforms to the citation standards; there are just a few inconsistencies, e.g., in (not) using italics or unsorted references in brackets, also "et al." is written as "et al" in the whole text).

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

The candidate proved ability to use and apply the relevant literature and create a reasonable research design. The strengths of the presented thesis are the clear and precise description of the phases of conducted analysis and the interpretation of the results. In my opinion, the main weaknesses of the text are formal inconsistencies and minor mistakes that negatively affect the overall impression of the thesis. Compared to the detailed interpretation of results (and possible limitations), the concluding part could be more developed and not too general (and short). I suggest to evaluate the thesis submitted by Boyd-Madsen Louis by mark B or C, depending on the course of defense.

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

5.1	Have you considered using the original scales (created by you) instead of re-using the scales from the previous research? Why? Why not?
5.2	What could be also considered as limitation(s) while taking into account that you coded all the material by yourself?

6. ANTIPLAGIARISM CHECK

X The reviewer is familiar with the thesis' score in plagiarism analysis in SIS.

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

6.1	The overall similarity is 18%. The scales in the research (in Appendix 1) are heavily based on the scales in the previously published studies, but the candidate describes and admits this fact in the thesis text. Due to that, I do not consider the score as problematic.
-----	--

7. SUGGESTED GRADE OF THE THESIS AS A WHOLE (choose one or two)

- A
- B
- C
- D
- E
- F

If the mark is an "F", please provide your reasons for not recommending the thesis for defence:

--

Date: 23/08/2023

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.