



## Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Morgan Henley

Title: Differences and similarities between business and environmental constituencies within UN climate negotiations

Programme/year: MV/2017

Author of Evaluation (supervisor): Michal Parížek

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
<b>Major Criteria</b>			
	Research question, definition of objectives	<b>10</b>	8
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	<b>30</b>	22
	Methodology, analysis, argument	<b>40</b>	30
<i>Total</i>		<b>80</b>	60
<b>Minor Criteria</b>			
	Sources	<b>10</b>	8
	Style	<b>5</b>	5
	Formal requirements	<b>5</b>	3
<i>Total</i>		<b>20</b>	16
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>100</b>	76



## **Evaluation**

### Major criteria:

A fairly well defined research with meaningful hypotheses and good amount of relevant empirical evidence to test them with.

I think the theoretical core of the work could be more extensive - the author selects a specific perspective - democratic contribution of TNA actors - and then the entire work only refers to this perspective. It is basically fine, but one could have also much more explicitly dealt with alternative explanations for the observed patterns, so look eg at organizational studies, negotiations analysis, etc., to understand why TNAs behave the way they do.

The text has a somewhat informal structure - e.g. the development of the hypotheses is mostly inductive and heavily influenced by Pulver, presented almost on a side. But substantively it is alright, the hypotheses, although not directly derived from the theoretical debate (rather motivated by it) are intuitive and meaningful. The literature review is extensive and covers multiple dimensions of TNAs involvement in the negotiations. It is a bit scattered at points, so the reader needs to make the connections between the individual sections and subsections.

The methods section is under-developed, it would be good to discuss more explicitly the sampling methods, as the interview form the empirical core of the thesis.

The empirical analysis is very rich and one learns quite a bit from the illustrative quotes, I like it. H1 and H2 are at points difficult to distinguish in the empirical evidence, ie their empirical manifestations overlap.

### Minor criteria:

Occasional typos and quite frequent problems in references formatting (UNFCCC - with no details! - eg p 23, 24; long quote p. 31). Some references missing from the list (Backstrand et al).



**FACULTY  
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
Charles University

Overall evaluation:

This is a solid master thesis which is based on interesting empirical evidence, addressing a topic relevant both in terms of current debates in academic research (TNA access to IOs) and in terms of policy-making. The thesis could be more rigorous – it is well written and intuitively plausible, so a bit tighter connection to the existing research and methodologies would have further improved it. Overall, good job.

Suggested grade: Very good (2)

Signature:

9/6/2017