



Report on the part of the master state examination Record of the thesis defence

Academic year: 2021/2022

Student's name and surname: Puck Anne Wagemaker
Student's ID: 81256577

Type of the study programme: Master's (post-Bachelor)
Study programme: Journalism, Media and Globalisation
Study ID: 685599

Title of the thesis: The response of Dutch political journalists to the counter-narrative from right-wing populist parties PVV and FvD to the securitization of COVID-19

Thesis department: Department of Journalism (23-KZ)

Language of the thesis: English

Language of defence: English

Advisor: Mgr. Anna Shavit, Ph.D.

Reviewer(s): PhDr. Michal Dimitrov, Ph.D.

Date of defence: 16.09.2022 **Venue of defence:** Praha

Attempt: regular

Course of defence: Welcome: doc. Alice Němcová Tejkalová
Candidate's presentation:
1.Introduction, objectives of the study
2.Research questions presented
3.Theoretical framework - Copenhagen School, Securitization, the role of the audience, populism, framing
4.Research and data collection - Small N case Study
5.Findings
6.Discussion
7. Limitations and recommendations

Reviews read and commented on by the candidate.

Anna Shavit, Ph.D. (supervisor):

The presented diploma thesis is a very successful study that skillfully connects theoretical concepts such as populism and securitization on the example of the approach of the Dutch far-wing parties. At the same time, it examines the role of journalists and their ability and readiness to open up complex topics.

I am pleased to recommend the master thesis for the defense with a grade of A.

Suggested Grade: A

Michal Dimitrov, Ph.D. (opponent):

Wagemaker presents an outstanding and original thesis that has no doubt a potential to be published (after necessary adjustments including removing repetitive passages and information) and/or presented at a relevant forum (such as the annual Prague Populism Conference). The author shows the ability to anchor her research theoretically, create a solid research design and embed it in a broad

context (in this case of securitization policies, populism, Dutch politics, media logic and news values, previous research etc.) She shows ability to communicate with the past research and has ambition to formulate new research questions. However, her conclusion about "a third variant" to "gate-closed" and "gate-open" should be better explained. This point could be addressed by the author when defending the thesis (see question 5.1).

Suggested Grade: A

Questions asked and answered:

Supervisor: Anna Shavit, PhD.

How much did you expect journalists' attitudes would be critical of the parties and how much was some of the information wholly new and surprising to you?

Opponent: Michal Dimitrov, PhD.

Wagemaker identifies a "third variant visible in the gatekeeper role next to solely opening and closing the gates, something that the literature did not elaborate on so far." (p. 52) Could she explain it in more detail? Why does she define a new category beyond "gate-open" and "gate-closed"?

The author investigated and analyzed the (ex-post) perceptions and considerations of the selected political journalists on their role when reporting on counter-narratives of the populist parties, however she did not investigate/analyze the texts they produced. Could the combination of two methods (semi-structured interviews and, e.g. qualitative/quantitative content analysis as the author suggests in the conclusion, p. 52) possibly change the conclusion of the research - and if yes, how?

The author admits that "the sample size of seven journalists is relatively limited to generalize the results to all Dutch political journalists" and "the research is a small-N case study, the findings are representative and applicable only to this specific case and situation". (p. 29) How would/could a bigger sample possibly change the result/conclusion of the thesis? What should be done to make a generalization of the results possible?

The author suggests expanding the research to a wider region. (p. 52) How would she adjust/change the research design in order to enable an international comparative perspective? Which other countries than Belgium would she suggest to include in the research?

Discussion follows

Final Grade announced: A

Result of defence:	excellent (A)
Chair of the board:	doc. PhDr. Alice Němcová Tejkalová, Ph.D. (present)
Committee members:	Mgr. Veronika Macková, Ph.D. (present)
	doc. Robert Silverio, Ph.D. (present)
	Mgr. Anna Shavit, Ph.D. (present)