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 x

Thesis author:

        Surname and given name: Sanjeev Puranik Radha

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

Reviewer:

        Surname and given name: Turková Ksteřina

        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	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.2	Methodology	x	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.3	Thesis structure	x	☐	☐	☐	☐

COMMENTARY (description of the relationship between the research proposal and the thesis. If there are problems, please be specific):
Research objectives, methodology, and thesis structure conform to the approved proposal, while the minor necessary changes are adequately incorporated and explained.

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

COMMENTARY (description of thesis content and the main problems):
The candidate was able to define the research gaps and justify the purpose of her research. She included relevant sources to support her arguments in the text, from iconic ones to highly recent publications, and she then applied those sources further in the thesis. The candidate described not only the method of data collection, but also the way of data processing, which I personally appreciate, as well as the research transparency. The candidate demonstrated the skills to conduct sound empirical research, but I wonder why she did not use any quantitative method (see question) that would allow her to explore more material (I do not criticize the approach, but I am interested in the reason behind the decision). The Discussion and Conclusion are, in some passages, a bit confusing (in terms of structure), but fulfill their purpose. The topic of the thesis is original and contributes to academic knowledge production in journalism and communication 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	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)	D
3.5	Conformity to quotation standards (*)	B
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	B

(*) 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 form is solid; hence I identified only a few mistakes. The Abstract is very long; it serves more as an extended Introduction. Discussion, Conclusion, and List of references should not be numbered. The candidate refers to the sources, but minor deviations from the reference style (e.g., in order of in-text references in case there is more than one stated) were detected. The thesis conforms to the quotation standards. Where the longer passages (e.g., a sentence) were indicated by Turnitin as similar to other text(s), the source was stated or/and these passages can be considered as generic phrases. However, the compilation of text is not fully non-problematic; there are parts that would deserve more precise paraphrasing or use of direct quotations (e.g., last paragraph on p. 30; p. 47-48). The structure of the thesis is logical and the academic terminology is used correctly by the candidate. Moreover, she was able to support her arguments with facts, sources, and results of the analysis. The thesis is easy to read; only minor language and stylistic mistakes (e. g., typos, inconsistently (non)capitalized headlines, three dots, etc.) appear in the text.

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

I think that this MA thesis is very good, and Radha Sanjeev Puranik demonstrated the ability to conduct and present her academic research in a solid and transparent way. I think that Radha Sanjeev Puraniks MA thesis deserves to be evaluated with a grade "B", based on its high quality and the minor mistakes mentioned above.

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

5.1	Why is this research based purely on qualitative methods? Did you consider using any quantitative method? (If yes, which / If no, why not)
5.2	Did you experience any difficulties while contacting the journalists or during the interview? Were they, for example, sensitive regarding any topic(s)?

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 Turnitin is 18%. The similarity is indicated mainly in the thesis template, direct quotations and list of references.

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

A	☐	Excellent (excellent performance)
B	x	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: 4. 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.