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: YANG Chu
Thesis title: Who Decides What's News: News Frame Analysis of China's Covid-19 coverage of The New York Times and The Washington Post
Reviewer:
Surname and given name: MIESSLER Jan
Affiliation: KMS IKSZ 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): The thesis is consistent with the research proposal.

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	A
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	A

COMMENTARY (description of thesis content and the main problems):
Comparing two of the most established US dailies, The New York Times and The Washington Post, in their coverage of China as a place of origin of the COVID-19 pandemics provides an opportunity to explore differences of similarly mainstream but differently politically aligned news institutions. The reviewed thesis takes advantage of this opportunity and explores factors influencing different framing of the same event within the field of US hard news journalism.

The thesis starts with providing relevant context. The literature review presents key works about foreign correspondence and international news flows eventually zooming in to coverage of China in the contemporary US media. The presentation is clear and shows author's familiarity with her chose field. Theoretically, the thesis is based on Goffmann's framing analysis. Methodologically, the author uses content analysis on a well-chosen sample of articles. The findings are presented in a way that highlights the main findings but does not really show the process of the analysis itself. However, the rich description of the results and the discussion of their implication are very well done. The results themselves constitute a relevant contribution to the discussion in the 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	A
3.2	Quality of the argumentation	A
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)	A
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):
There are no formal problems. The thesis is concise, and its parts are well balanced.

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

The thesis is a well designed and well executed piece of relevant research. The only minor flaw is a missing clear explanation how the analysis has been done. Everything else indicates that the author knows her field well enough to be able to highlight what is important in a concise and convincing way.

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

5.1	
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 system shows either properly quoted text or short snippets of common phrases.

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

A ☒ Excellent (excellent performance)
B ☐ Excellent (excellent performance)
C ☐ Very Good (above the average standard but with some errors)
D ☐ Very Good (above the average standard but with some errors)
E ☐ Good (generally sound work with a number of notable errors)
F ☐ Fail (unsatisfactory performance)

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

Date:12. 9. 2024   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.