

External Examiner's Report on PhD dissertation *Reception of Strategic Economic Narratives: Case Study of Kenyan News Discourse* by Vilém Řehák for the purposes of LARGE DEFENCE (VELKÁ OBHAJOBA):

This report is meant to deal with the issues found by the reviewer as problematic before the Small Defence took place. In particular, I will focus on the main conceptual, structural and formal aspects of Řehák's work I had found difficult in the original manuscript of the thesis.

The major issue I pointed out was the problematic conceptualisation and formulation of some of the research questions posed by the author. I found the second RQ whether the image of the external economic partners (the US, the EU, and China) in Kenyan news discourse has changed during the analysed period nonsensical from the adopted processual perspective. I argued that given the non-monolithic nature of any news discourse, the image is always ambivalent. The third RQ whether some of the models of foreign economic policy and real policies associated with them echo in Kenyan news discourse quantitatively more or qualitatively differently from the others seemed also unclear, and redundant as it tended to already anticipate a certain answer irrespective of the research done. The last RQ whether regional integration is part of any of the models, whether it complements them, or whether it is some form of counter-narrative against the global superpowers was also a bit problematic, even impossible to answer.

In the latest version of his thesis, Řehák has successfully managed to reduce the four former research questions into one major RQ, which is further elaborated into several meaningful sub-questions. This has led to a new, updated structure of the thesis, which is now more coherent and meaningful.

The author reacted to almost all major, as well as minor aspects I raised in the previous review. First, he added a paragraph to Introduction on how the global and regional economic and political forces fit into the general framework of new regionalism. Second, he inserted a short explanation on the choice of Kenya in the Introduction as suggested. Third, some of the headings were changed – now they are better corresponding to the sections. Fourth, he managed to add a section dealing with his own position as an Africanist and international relations scholar in the IR/IPE, though his firm statement that “the Czech tradition of research in Political Science is for historical reasons linked to the European qualitative/interpretivist constructivist tradition” (p. 38) is difficult to accept unambiguously. It would be easily dismissed pointing to the current teaching situation and