

REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

IEPS – International Economic and Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Title of the thesis:	Mexico and climate change in the international context according to political agendas
Author of the thesis:	Marjhory Melissa Iturbe Perez
Referee (incl. titles):	Mgr. Lukáš Perutka, Ph.D.

Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the five numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).

1) Theoretical background: The theoretical background (i.e. agenda-setting theory) suits well the presented thesis. It is well integrated into the text and sets interesting hypothesis that is tested and answered in the conclusion. However, regarding the theoretical part of the thesis, I have two objections. Some important terms are not defined well or not at all. This is apparent especially in the frequented cases like “multilateral country” or just briefly mentioned topics “Estrada Doctrine” on page 42. Furthermore, I understand the topic was quite delimited, but I would also welcome the evaluation of the instruments (considering the climate change) adopted by the Mexican governments and more importantly to what results they led.

2) Contribution: The presented thesis is very original, not just in the Czech context. Climate policies of the Mexican government are rather omitted topic, especially when we consider the current government undercut research expenses and focuses on the development of fossil fuels energy. The student is able to interpret the sources, analyses the policies and draws well-funded and argued conclusions. They are also in line with the current knowledge about the last three Mexican governments.

3) Methods: The hypothesis is clearly stated, tested and verified in the conclusion. The methods fit very well into the research design, as political discourse analysis is sound to both international and national climate agenda of the Mexican government. Also, comparative method is well suited to compare the policies of last three Mexican presidents. The overall structure is well described and even the author tends to description instead of analysis, throughout the text it is only marginal or could be defined as contextual detour.

4) Literature: The author was able to find relevant documents and literature for her thesis. She proved that she could analyse and interpret it in an original way to support her arguments. The bibliography is also very representative, and the number of sources proves the dedication of the author. It is noticeable, that she uses a lot of online sources but most of them are official documents. Besides, the actual topics always have to rely more on the internet because the scientific literature at all times lags behind the actual topics.

5) Manuscript form: Overall, the thesis is clear and well structured. However, on the microlevel it has some issues and lacks a bit of focus. The agenda-setting definition is present on page 10 and repeated word-by-word on page 19. Similarly, the General Climate Change Law is discussed in the same fashion on pages 38, 43 and 66.

The formal part of the thesis is its weakness. The quotation system lacks unification, the bibliography is a bit disorganized, especially in paging, and the language needed more thorough revision. It has problems with grammar, syntax, style, and word choices. Overall, it is difficult to read and comprehend at some places.

Box for the thesis supervisor only. Please characterize the progress in the working out of thesis (e.g., steady and gradual versus discontinuous and abrupt) and the level (intensity) of communication/cooperation with

the author: The cooperation with the student was gradual, and non-problematic. She communicated well with me and incorporated the majority of my recommendations into the text.

Suggested questions for the defence are:

„How is the American president Joe Biden’s administration evaluating climate change policy and energetic policy of the AMLO’s government with regard to the NAFTA/USMCA treaties?“

I recommend the thesis for final defence.

SUMMARY OF POINTS AWARDED (for details, see below):

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Theoretical background (max. 20 points)</i>	15
<i>Contribution (max. 20 points)</i>	20
<i>Methods (max. 20 points)</i>	20
<i>Literature (max. 20 points)</i>	20
<i>Manuscript form (max. 20 points)</i>	10
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points)	85
The proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F)	B

DATE OF EVALUATION: 24/1/2022

Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Quality standard
91 – 100	A	= outstanding (high honour)
81 – 90	B	= superior (honour)
71 – 80	C	= good
61 – 70	D	= satisfactory
51 – 60	E	= low pass at a margin of failure
0 – 50	F	= failing. The thesis is not recommended for defence.