

# Posudek oponenta diplomové práce

Studijní program: **Mezinárodní ekonomické vztahy**

Studijní obor: **International and Diplomatic Studies**

Akademický rok: **2013/2014**

Název práce: **INGOs and the concept of good governance: the case of Amnesty International**

Řešitel: **David Zlotos**

Vedoucí práce: **prof. PhDr. Vladimíra Dvořáková, CSc.**

Oponent: **Ing. Petr Vymětal, Ph.D.**

	Hlediska	Stupeň hodnocení
1.	Stupeň splnění cíle práce	<b>3</b>
2.	Logická stavba práce	<b>3</b>
3.	Práce s literaturou, citace	<b>2</b>
4.	Adekvátnost použitých metod	<b>4</b>
5.	Hloubka analýzy ve vztahu k tématu	<b>4</b>
6.	Vlastní přístup k řešení	<b>3</b>
7.	Formální úprava práce	<b>1</b>
8.	Jazyková a stylistická úprava práce	<b>2</b>

## Konkrétní připomínky a dotazy k práci:

The author's topic is interesting and is a reaction on the growing importance of the INGO's activities in the last decades. However it seems to be great topic to introduce combining both the theory and the case study of chosen INGO, the thesis is rather complicated.

Thesis is structured as follows. The first three chapters introduce theories of J. Habermas and T.R. Davies. The structure seems a little bit too fragmented, on the other part, the theoretical part is built sufficiently. Next two chapters deals with Amnesty International – fourth describes the history, activities, accountability mechanisms and criticism of AI. The name of the last chapter is rather to be a little bit confusing – the author mostly deals with accountability measures implemented in AI and the key idea of the chapter remains unclear to me.

There are many problems in the thesis. First, it is quite unclear what is the goal of the thesis. There is no question formulated to answer, no hypothesis to verify/falsify in the introduction. It is not clear why the chapters contain what they contain, what the thesis wants to solve. Second, in the theoretical part, I am missing introduction of the good governance concept. Third, from the methodological point of view there is a very weak link (if there is any) between the theoretical part of the thesis and the fourth and fifth chapter. The introduction is pretty vague contrary the conclusion – on the other hand it is not clear, why the author propose such concluding remarks. Those are the most serious problems that the student of master level must manage.

There are no serious problems from the linguistic, grammar and syntax point of view, as well as the format of the thesis. All sources are cited, the list of reference is included however the list is not always ordered well.

The thesis is on the edge of acceptance. In the case of excellent defend I proposed to grade it as "good".

QUESTIONS: 1) Do you know how many INGO sign up to the INGO Charter? 2) What are the motives of INGO to sign up for accountability mechanisms and Accountability Chapter? 3) What was the key question of your thesis?

**Závěr:** Diplomovou práci **doporučuji k obhajobě.**

Navrhovaná výsledná klasifikace práce:      **3**

Datum: 30. 08. 2014

**Ing. Petr Vymětal, Ph.D.**  
oponent práce