

**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: Radha Puranik

**Thesis title:** Media Framing of Civic Issues in Post-Pandemic Mumbai: A Study of Urban Governance and Civic Journalism

**Reviewer:**

Surname and given name: Sandra Lábová

Affiliation: IKSŽ

**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):

**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	B
2.3	Quality and soundness of the empirical research	C
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):

The literature review and theoretical framework are well-developed and effectively aligned with the study's objectives, providing a discussion of relevant studies and concepts. However, there are a few areas where further clarification and elaboration could enhance the overall quality of the work.

For example, explaining more explicitly how key concepts, such as citizen journalism, directly relate to and support the study's research objectives would be beneficial. In the literature review, Radha Puranik introduces several compelling ideas. Furthermore, specific concepts, such as hyper-local journalism, would benefit from more detailed explanations. A more comprehensive exploration of these concepts would clarify their meanings, highlight their relevance to the study, enrich the reader's understanding, and reinforce the importance of these concepts within the broader research context.

In the methodology section, Radha Puranik discusses the theories behind the selected methods, including qualitative content analysis and semi-structured interviews. She also covers aspects of sampling, data collection, and data analysis. Overall, this chapter is comprehensive. However, the discussion on semi-structured interviews should address potential limitations, such as the influence of personal bias, the inherent subjectivity of the interview process, and the challenges of generalizing findings from semi-structured interviews. Additionally, the section on sampling (page 39) should provide more detailed information about the entire dataset from which the articles were randomly selected. For example, some preliminary research must have been conducted before the random selection. How was this research carried out? What keywords were used? What was the time frame? What was the total sample size of the chosen articles for analysis? Including these details would strengthen the transparency and rigor of the sampling process.

The following chapter (4 Findings) is organized by method and presents the results of qualitative content analysis and semi-structured interviews.

The presentation of the content analysis results currently reads more like a summary of key findings rather than a thorough analysis that would yield compelling results. Given a relatively low number of articles, discussing and analyzing each article individually would be beneficial in identifying and describing the emerging themes and frames. The analysis feels too brief and lacks the necessary depth, raising concerns about whether it was conducted in alignment with the proposed analytical method.

On the other hand, the analysis of the semi-structured interviews offers a more robust interpretation of the main findings. The discussion provides valuable insights, but it would be even more beneficial to connect the emerging themes and subthemes, demonstrating how they relate to each other and contribute to the overall narrative of the study. Incorporating a visual representation, such as a diagram or thematic map, could significantly enhance comprehension by illustrating these connections and making the relationships between the themes more explicit.

### 3. EVALUATION OF THE THESIS FORM

		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

Use letters A – B – C – D – E – F (A=best, F= failed)(\*) 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):

3.4 Quality, quantity, and appropriateness of the citations (both in the theory part and the empirical part) Some of these ideas (e.g., those found on page 19) lack appropriate references, which is essential for maintaining the academic rigor and credibility of the work.

3.6 Use of an academic writing style and correct use of language (both grammar and spelling) – There are a few repetitive parts and some double.

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

The thesis has several strengths, such as a well-aligned literature review and a solid theoretical framework. The methodology section is comprehensive, and the analysis of semi-structured interviews is insightful.

However, the work has significant areas for improvement. The literature review lacks clear connections between key concepts and research objectives, and some concepts need further explanation. The content analysis is too superficial, and the sampling process lacks transparency. Additionally, the thesis could address potential biases in the semi-structured interviews, improving citation practices and refining repetitive language. I suggest grading between B and C, depending on the defense.

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

5.1	What steps were taken in the sampling process to ensure transparency and rigor, including details about the dataset, keywords used, and the total sample size from which articles were selected?
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	Turnitin shows 18% similarity. However, quotations are handled correctly.
-----	---

**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: 27th August 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.*