

**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: Herber Rebecca Theresa

**Thesis title:** Climate Justice Discourse in German Quality Newspapers Along the Political Spectrum

**Reviewer:**

Surname and given name: Neag Annamaria, PhD

Affiliation: IKSZ

**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 is no description of the relationship between the research proposal and the thesis, but there are no relevant divergences noted.

**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	C
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 thesis deals with one of the greatest, if not the greatest, issues of our time: the climate crisis. More specifically it builds upon the newer concept of climate justice, and its mediatic representation.

The Introduction provides a clear description of the aims of the research, while the Literature Review presents a wide-ranging overview of the works that had been done in this field. In the Theoretical Framework, the different layers of climate justice are well presented, but the reasons why these are introduced should have been mentioned earlier, so as the reader understands the author's intentions. The media sampling seems accurate, although it is not clear from the explanation why choosing a Springer publication is relevant. The Limitations section shows a clear understanding of the disadvantages of the chosen methodology.

Within the Findings section, it is not clear how the author identified the discourses presented (i.e. the steps taken to find these discourses). While the described discourses are pertinent, a specific focus on language (i.e. rhetorical devices) is more prominent in certain sections than others (e.g. in section C), which makes the analysis somewhat uneven.

**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	A
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)	B
3.5	Conformity to quotation standards (*)	A
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 text is easy to follow and it uses a proper academic writing style. There is an over-reliance on quotations, which could have been easily paraphrased. In some cases, sections are not properly introduced (e.g. section A in Findings and Analysis).

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

**This is a well-written dissertation on a very relevant contemporary issue that needs to be tackled. The thesis shows wide-reading and understanding of the main academic discussions on the topic. The discourses found are interesting and point towards a more general approach of the media across the Global North. This aspect and its implications could have been further discussed. In terms of more specific weaknesses beyond those noted above, the most important is the fact that it is not clear to what extent the second part of RQ1 has been answered, or indeed if this can be actually answered through the chosen methods (how might the articles contribute to the public discourse?). There is also a lack of clarity when it comes to how CDA was actually employed.**

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

5.1	You mention that CDA is frequently used in 'solidarity with dominated groups'. How do you see your own position as a researcher, from this perspective?
5.2	
5.3	
5.4	

**6. ANTIPLAGIARISM CHECK**

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 score is above the threshold, but there are no major issues noted, beyond smaller similarities.
-----	---

**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:20.08.2023

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.*