

Name of the student:	Milica Zindovic
Title of the thesis:	Construction and Linguistic Portrayal of Climate Change Phenomenon in Right-Wing Populist Parties' Political Discourse
Reviewer:	Martin Mejstrik (Charles University)

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD

(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

The MA Thesis of Milica Zindovic offers a relevant and important research question in the field of populism studies: how climate change is portrayed linguistically in a political discourse of radical right-wing populist parties in Europe. The author clearly defined and justified her research question. Milica chose still an innovative topic - even if there are articles about the relationship between populism and environment, few of them focus on construction of linguistic portrayal of this variable. The only minor issue is that Milica's work does not include a hypothesis which could be tested, it would strengthen her main argument. The author presents in her thesis a comprehensive state of the art which shows her good orientation in the researched topic, even though it could include more literature on general understanding of radical right-wing populism.

2. ANALYSIS

(methodology, argument, theoretical backing, appropriate work with sources):

Milica had to cope in her thesis with few secondary sources which she could base her research on. Nevertheless, she overcame these obstacles and put together a convincing and solid research design. Case studies are also well justified, however, it might be more useful for the main argument to choose a different party than Fidest which is not a typical RRWP and also it's a party in power which influences its narrative. Discourse-historical approach is also employed without major problems, however, the author focuses on three discursive strategies (nomination, predication, and argumentation), which are not fully analysed and could be further developed. In general, the author succeeded in connecting the research design and the methodology in order to build her argument.

3. CONCLUSIONS

(persuasiveness, link between data and conclusions, achievement of research objectives):

Milica's thesis is a coherent research text which analyses how climate change narrative is constructed and linguistically portrayed in radical right-wing populist parties in their discourse. She shows differences among these parties and based on these three case studies made a conclusion that not all populist parties on the right have to adopt an anti-environmental discourse. The author did a satisfactory job in construction of her research design and its application in her research and thus to achieve her research objectives.

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE

(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

The MA thesis of Milica Zindovic is written without major formal issues. It's well-structured, the author used appropriate and correct language and works well with citation style and bibliography. In general, the thesis fully adheres to academic standards in the EPS Programme.

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

Overall, the thesis is of a very good quality. The author shows a systematic work in analysing the discourse of radical right-wing parties in Europe on environmental issues. Her research is quite innovative and well explained and embedded in the current state of the arts. The only important issue is a lack of clear connection between the research output and analysed factors. Also, the lack of hypothesis is lowering the general impression from the thesis.

Grade (A-F):	B+; 8.2
Date:	Signature:
27 June 2021	Martin Mejstrik

classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
	Range	%	Mean	%	Range	%	Range	%
A (91-100)	91-100 %	8,5%	5	6,7%	8,5-10	5,3%	9-10	5,5 %
B (81-90)	81-90 %	16,3%	4,5	11,7%	7,5-8,4	16,4%	8-8,9	11,0 %
C (71-80)	71-80 %	16,3%	4	20%	6,5-7,4	36,2%	7-7,9	18,4 %
D (61-70)	61-70 %	24%	3,5	28,3%			6-6,9	35,2 %
E (51-60)	51-60 %	34,9%	3	33,4 %	6-6,4	42,1 %	5-5,9	30,1 %

Assessment criteria:

Excellent (A): 'Outstanding performance with only minor errors';

Very good (B): 'Above the average standard but with some errors';

Good (C): 'Generally sound work but with a number of notable errors';

Satisfactory (D): 'Fair but with significant shortcomings';

Sufficient (E): 'Performance meets the minimum criteria';

Fail: 'Some/considerable more work required before the credit can be awarded'.