



## Master's Thesis Evaluation Form

**Student's name:** Öykü Demirkır

**Thesis title:** Solidarity Academies in Turkey: An analysis of academic activism, parrhesia, and commoning practices.

**Name of the supervisor:** Martin Hájek

**Name of the opponent:**

What are the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis? Please give your reasons for the suggested grade in detail below.

1. *Does the author show understanding of one or more theories, and use theory to generate a hypothesis or to make the problem area more understandable.*

Comments: The thesis aims to understand the phenomenon of academic resistance to authoritarian power in contemporary Turkey through voice and education offered to the public. The author searches for theories which would give a meaning to this resistance as a practice to do good, which may seem futile in terms of political realism. The theoretical part is somewhat eclectic; nevertheless, it explains how notions of parrhesia and instituent practices may help understand the phenomenon under study.

2. *Is the research question articulated clearly and properly? Is the research question sufficiently answered in the conclusion?*

Comments: The research questions are clearly stated and they are answered throughout the main body the thesis.

3. *Is the thesis based on relevant research and literature and does it accurately summarize and integrate the information?*

Comments: Yes, I think so. The theoretical sources sometimes seem to be chosen in a not entirely systematic way, but they are compelling enough for me.



4. *What is the quality of the data or the other sources? Are the sampling method, data collection and data analysis appropriate?*

Comments: The empirical part is the weakest point of the thesis because of lack of data for a systematic and thorough qualitative analysis of the phenomenon. However, Turkey's current political situation makes it difficult to do field research and interviews on the resistance against the regime. Some participants refused to be interviewed; some initiatives ceased their activities; information about the happenings and actions was no longer available. On the other hand, the author could be more transparent in describing her research strategy.

5. *Are the findings relevant to the research question? Are the conclusions of the thesis based on strong arguments?*

Comments: In my view, the thesis was not intended to provide strong arguments. Instead, the author explored the theoretical possibilities of explaining the phenomenon of academic resistance in Turkey as doing public good. This aim was achieved satisfactorily.

6. *Are the author's thoughts distinguished unambiguously from the borrowed ideas?*

Comments: Yes.

7. *Is the thesis containing original/innovative research (regarding topic, approach, and findings)?*

Comments: Yes, it does. I particularly appreciate the attempt to find an empirical referent for notions of parrhesia and instituent practices.

8. *What are the quality of style and other formal requirements?*

Comments: Sometimes, there are long passages with accumulated quotations and arguments, which are difficult to understand. It would be better to split them into shorter paragraphs with more transparent argumentative points. As concerns the formal requirements, I found only minor defects in the Bibliography.

9. *Are there any other strengths and weaknesses of the thesis, which are not included in the previous questions? Please list them if any.*

Comments: -

10. *What topic do you suggest for the discussion in the thesis defence?*

Comments: I suggest the methodology of the data analysis should be explained during the defence. It is only fragmentarily described in the thesis.



**FACULTY  
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
Charles University

Overall assessment of the thesis:

Despite my critical comments concerning the theoretical eclecticism and the empirical research, the thesis fulfils all necessary standards required, and I recommend it for defence.

Proposed grade: C

Date: January 29, 2021

Signature: