

Assessment of Master Thesis – Opponent



Study programme: **International Economic Relations**
 Field of study: **International and Diplomatic Studies**
 Academic year: **2015/2016**
 Master Thesis Topic: **Reflection of "otherness" in international relations**
 Author's name: **Daniel Kvašňák, BA**
 Ac. Consultant's Name: **Ing. Jan Martin Rolenc**
 Opponent: **Ing. Tomáš Doležal**

	Criterion	Mark (1–4)
1.	Overall objective achievement	2
2.	Logical structure	1
3.	Using of literature, citations	2
4.	Adequacy of methods used	2
5.	Depth of analysis	2
6.	Self-reliance of author	1
7.	Formal requirements: text, graphs, tables	1
8.	Language and stylistics	2

Comments and Questions:

The chosen case study is a very topical one and Daniel Kvašňák not only uses the corresponding theoretical framework but also shows his own fine comprehension of the relevant IR theory's background. Given the fact the paper seems to aspire to become mainly an empirical analysis, not a theoretically innovative study, there is, however, a disproportion between the too general theoretical part (pp 15-39), the section dedicated to the particular methodology (p 14) and the empirical analysis of the case per se (pp 40-76). Especially some space dedicated to the description of IR theory development might have been used much more usefully for author's own analysis of the case itself (or at least e.g. for the more specialized overview of the academic literature on more specific research areas such as securitization of migration or discourse on migration etc.) Unfortunately, both the Introduction as well as the "Research methods" section lack more precise definition of a research design, and author does not explain at all the way how and why the sample of analysed documents was selected. It is not even clear whether the main aim is to apply media discourse analysis or whether the discourse of particular actors such as particular governments or the EU or selected NGOs is to be explored properly based on their official documents or speech acts. In the Abstract author states that the paper analyses "how immigration is being increasingly securitized by the European Union and its member states along with what makes securitization the hegemonic discourse" (p 8) while the section 1.1. (Research methods) states only that the mix of "media articles, speeches, press releases and official policy documents" are to be studied. The selection of the sample documents is thus not only lacking the explicit reflection but seems to be rather a random choice of various types of materials which limits the significance of the final results and their interpretation. Furthermore, the brief methodological section reads that "paper will not rely on qualitative analysis as it does not correspond to the focus of the paper" (p 14) which is probably a mere mistype but adds to the overall vagueness and confusion concerning the methodology. Actually, at least some brief quantitative data showing the numbers of documents selected, the frequency and most importantly the relative proportions of the appearance would enable to fulfil the very aim of the paper – to prove whether the securitization narrative is dominant (or even "hegemonic") in contrast to the other particular ways of rhetorical framing used to depict immigration in media, by governments and by the EU institutions. The author structures well the empirical part by dividing the text into relevant sub-chapters logically. Firstly the two opposing discourse perspectives are distinguished and treated individually and then both the state and the EU level are elaborated.

To sum up: the original intention, the research topic and some of the results must be appreciated and the

author proves his ability and analytical skills to apply theoretical concepts into particular case. Still I believe that the submitted paper lags behind Mr. Kvasnak's capacity. Overall evaluation: very good or excellent (if defended and explained perfectly)

Question 1: Have you found any particular differences in how particular governments have been treating immigration in their discourse? Question 2: Do you see any distinction between the media discourse and top representatives' political discourse – concerning general theoretical implications and concerning the impact on public sphere within your case study?

Conclusion: The Master Thesis is recommended for the defence.

Suggested Grade: **2**

Date: 08/17/2016

Ing. Tomáš Doležal

Opponent