

Name of the student:	Zindovic Milica
Title of the thesis:	Construction and Linguistic Portrayal of Climate Change Phenomenon in Right-Wing Populist Parties' Political Discourse
Reviewer:	Prof. Javier Arregui

**1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD**

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

Milica's research question is well-made and justified. It is about how climate change is linguistically portrayed within a selection of European right-wing populist parties. This is a good question insofar as we do not have a great deal of information about the variation of these parties regarding climate change and environmental policies. What is missing here is probably a why. In other words, I believe that the systematic description of how European Right-wing parties (ERWP) linguistically portray climate change policies is clearly a step forward, but given the predictable variation, a discussion of this variation would have made this thesis more complete.

The central goal of the paper is rather innovative insofar as at this point we only have very poor information about the variation on the views that ERWP have on climate change policies. The dissertation offers a systematic and comprehensive state of the art review of the literature. There are not many studies on this topic, but clearly the literature review section covers the most important information and findings there have been so far. The thesis is more an exploratory study than a theoretically grounded study. This is why no formulation of hypotheses has been made.

**2. ANALYSIS**

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

Milica has clearly made an important effort in order to make a research paper on this topic. It is rather innovative, which points out the difficulty of obtaining sufficient data. Also, this points to challenges in analyzing data in different languages. Despite these concerns, the work stands up in a rather convincing way.

The thesis may be theoretically relevant insofar as it shows a great deal of variation across ERWP. This means that a number of explanatory variables must be at stake. Unfortunately, the paper only mentions these plausible explanatory factors but does not analyze them. Some of these theoretical factors include whether there is a minoritarian party or a party in office, whether the party is a radical or more moderate party, whether there are country-related factors and or party-related factors, etc. These explanatory factors might be used in the future, once the paper has clearly shown the great variation between ERWP.

In general terms, the research design is correct. I believe the three selected cases are well justified and they are substantive cases in political terms. Perhaps what it is missing is the time period under study. This does not appear in the paper, and I believe it is rather important insofar as it could clearly condition the results.

The methodology used to identify the critical discourse of the ERWP is also rather convincing. The author uses a sort of triangulation principle used in argumentation theory, the so-called topoi. It is a good technique in order to critically identify the arguments used by those parties in the documents analyzed. The exploratory nature of the paper has made the use of this technique easier insofar as it can focus in identifying these sorts of topos. Thus, the paper is rather consistent when combining the research design and the methodology in order to accurately answer the research question.

### 3. CONCLUSIONS

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

The thesis offers a convincing analysis on how climate change policy preferences are constructed and linguistically portrayed in right-wing populist party discourse. It shows an important level of variation across the three parties analyzed. In this sense, it goes beyond the accepted view that right-wing ideology is automatically linked to anti-environment discourse. This is well identified and demonstrated in the conclusions. The thesis needs to further develop the implications of these findings as well as the link between the findings and plausible explanatory factors for this variation.

### 4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE

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

The dissertation is well-structured, demonstrating a full understanding of and compliance with academic rules and standards, including the use of good academic language, referencing and use of appendixes.

### 5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

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

The stronger point of the thesis is its novelty in systematically analyzing the policy discourse of climate change across three important European right-wing parties. The structure of the paper is also consistent, which clearly helped clarify the logic behind the paper. The weakest part is the lack of development of a clear link between the findings and plausible factors that would help us clarify the variation found in the paper among right-wing parties.

All in all, Milica has written a good Master thesis. She has shown that she can complete good research, propose a quite novel research topic and has a great domain of the relevant literature, as well as think of a consistent research design.

<b>Grade (A-F):</b>	B (8)
Date:	Signature:
22.06.2021	

classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
	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'.