

# Posudek oponenta diplomové práce

Studijní program: **Mezinárodní ekonomické vztahy**

Studijní obor: **International and Diplomatic Studies**

Akademický rok: **2017/2018**

Název práce: **Euroskepticizmus a fungování Visegrádské skupiny**

Řešitel: **Tomáš Tabiš**

Vedoucí práce: **Ing. Mgr. Jan Němec, Ph.D.**

Oponent: **doc. PhDr. Karel Müller, Ph.D.**

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

## Konkrétní připomínky a dotazy k práci:

I find Tomáš MT very informative and knowledgeable, it provides a very good overview over forms and causes of Euroskepticism in Central Europe. Structure of the MT appears meaningful, sources' base is excellent, the MT shows signs of diligence, motivated approach, and analytical competence. As "opponent" let me focus on weaknesses. First of all I was not sure about what is an analytical unit; whether it is the Visegrad Group (VG), or these individual states. In the INTRO there is a clear reference to the VG, but the analysis pays more attention to the individual states and to their brief comparison. This I found little confusing. Equally, I found mismatches between goals and findings: "the research question is why did the Visegrad Group become one of the most Eurosceptic (!) entities in the European Union during past few years and how is this Euroscepticism being reflected?" and the one of many conclusions that „Euroscepticism does not really (colloquialism!) have a significant impact of the functioning of the Visegrad Group“. After reading the MT none of these were quite obvious to me (plus I did not understand the final bit of the research question about "being reflected"). Firstly, the MT did not explain WHY the VG states became the most Euroskeptics? That would require some kind of comparison with the other EU member states and with an EU-wide perspective. Secondly the whole MT seems to me indicates that varying and various relations of Central Europeans to the EU affect, indeed, the functioning of the VG. Minor points. The style and language of the MT are generally comprehensible and smooth, only sometimes too glossy (i.e. "They are referred to, by the Western countries, as post-Democracy"). There are, as far as me as a non-English speaker can say, many mistakes in the punctuation, but otherwise Tomáš has very good written English, though next time I would suggest consulting his writings with a qualified native speaker. I found few other inconsistencies in the text, such as using both "the EU" and "the European Union" notions; on the page 14 he argues as if David Cameron is still a relevant figure in British politics and refers to, somewhat inappropriately, Cameron's speech from 2013. However, having said that, Tomáš delivered a solid research paper, which would benefit from being narrowed down a bit, and if he tried to deepen the analytical level, plus if more clarity was given to what is the main goal, to research questions' framework and to the crucial findings summary. In the „defense“ of the MT I would like to ask Tomáš about his prediction on the future of the VG, or Slavkov Triangle respectively. Second question – since Tomáš wants to find out within his MT why the VG are among strongest Euroskeptics in the EU – are there any specific significant features in the VG countries' Euroskepticism compare to the Euroskepticism of the so called older member states? Or, do you consider the VG countries Euroskeptics different (or more dangerous or vicious for the EU democratic governance) compare to the older member states Euroskeptics?

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

Navrhovaná výsledná klasifikace práce: **2**

Datum: 29. 5. 2018

**doc. PhDr. Karel Müller, Ph.D.**  
oponent práce