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: Mar Segura Mondéjar
Thesis title: Post-colonial discourse in Spanish-speaking media: Framing of October 12th in Spanish and Mexican newspapers
Reviewer:
Surname and given name: František Géla
Affiliation: KŽ 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)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.2	Methodology	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.3	Thesis structure	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

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

COMMENTARY (description of thesis content and the main problems):
Mar Segura Mondéjar has chosen a topic related to culturally specific issues in post-colonial countries and colonial empires. The author used frame analysis, which could identify different approaches to the examined anniversary/festival/celebration in ideologically various kinds of media in multiple countries (colony vs colonizator).

In the literature review, the author introduces theoretical concepts and phenomenons related to the examined topic - post-colonial theory, shifts in the colonial discourse, the role of media and collective memory. She also describes the history and context of October 12th which I find very important because of the various levels of in-depth knowledge of this event in our area. For the research part, the author has chosen framing theory. The whole process is described in methodological chapters. The research questions are relevant and they are answered sufficiently. Via framing theory the author identified patterns used in relation to the central topic. In well-structured Findings section, the author presents the results of the frame analysis. The identified frames are always accompanied by particular examples (and citations). In the Discussion chapter she sets the findings in a broader context.

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)	A
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 thesis follows the academic requirements. The text is clear, every chapter has a logical structure (I appreciate rigid structure with brief introduction and summary in each chapter) and there are no issues regarding quotation standards.

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

The thesis presents a topic that is specific to former colonial countries and is relatively novel in our area. It deals with the differences between the perception (and its media image) of specific anniversary/festival/celebration that (as we assume) differs in two examined countries (Spain and Mexico). The thesis meets high requirements both in its theoretical and research part so I suppose to grade it A or B depending on the thesis defence.

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

5.1	Would there be differences if you focused on a wider sample of texts (wider time period of selected years)?
5.2	What are other days/festivals in Spain that may arouse similar controversies?
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	There is overall similarity more than 5 %. However, the identical parts of the text (predominantly in the theoretical and methodological chapters) are cited according to the citation standards.

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: 7. 9. 2023   Signature: ……………………………..