

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: Ahmed Ebad

Thesis title: The Analysis of Media Coverage of Afghan Taliban Takeover of Kabul in Pakistani Urdu Newspaper Jang

Reviewer:

Surname and given name: Turková Kateřina

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)	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Methodology	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	Thesis structure	x	<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):

The research objectives, methodology and thesis structure conform to the approved research proposal, with the necessary changes made during the process of writing.

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	D
2.2	Ability to critically evaluate and apply the literature	D
2.3	Quality and soundness of the empirical research	D
2.4	Ability to select the appropriate methods and to use them correctly	E
2.5	Quality of the conclusion	D
2.6	Thesis originality and its contribution to academic knowledge production	B

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

The theoretical background is sufficient, but the candidate dedicated an enormous space to the historical background, while I think it was not necessary to this extent. The candidate was able to use the academic literature, but the lack of critical evaluation is evident in some passages; the text is rather descriptive. The empirical research was conducted adequately, but the steps were not precisely characterized. The quantitative part was called an overview, not an analysis, which is correct in my opinion. The most problematic part is the summarization of the research; hence it seems confusing. Especially, the quotations from interviews were taken out of context and could be better summed up. The topic of the thesis is original, and it contributes to academic knowledge production in journalism and media studies.

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	E
3.2	Quality of the argumentation	E
3.3	Appropriate use of academic terminology	D

3.4	Quality, quantity and appropriateness of the citations (both in the theory part and in the empirical part)	D
3.5	Conformity to quotation standards (*)	E
3.6	Use of an academic writing style, and correct use of language (both grammar and spelling)	D
3.6	Quality of the textual lay-outing and appendices	E

(*) 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, but the confusing numbering spoils the overall impression. Moreover, the Introduction is way too long and it is divided into subchapters, which is not common for MA theses. The argumentation combines the candidate's personal knowledge, the results of the analysis, and the academic research; hence the candidate does not clearly distinguish between them, which is problematic. The textual lay-outing and formatting are weak parts of the thesis. The lay-out is inconsistent; there are many mistakes in the thesis template (e.g., wrong Institute, study program, and field of study stated; four empty pages at the end of the submitted PDF; use of various fonts, etc.). The candidate is able to use academic language, but the text contains a significant number of typos and stylistic mistakes. The referencing in the thesis is below average. However, the text conforms to fundamental quotation standards.

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

I appreciate that Ebad Ahmed dedicated his MA thesis to an interesting topic and was able to pose and answer reasonable research questions. In my opinion, the thesis deserves to be defended. Unfortunately, the text includes notable formal and content-related mistakes and problems mentioned above in this review. Due to that, I suggest to evaluate Ebad Ahmed's MA thesis by grade "E".

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

5.1	Why do you call the quantitative part "overview" (and not "content analysis")?
5.2	Do you have any researcher bias that could influence the research (and how)?
5.3	What is the biggest limitation of your research (in your opinion)?

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 due to the Turnitin system is 20%. The submitted thesis is not problematic regarding this manner, but it is obvious that the candidate paraphrased one source in the coherent passage of text, then used other text in a similar way, and so on. I do not think that this is a good practice and I would appreciate better work with literature and other sources, especially while considering the stage of studies.
-----	--

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 x 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: 6. 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.