

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): Matěj Hejtmánek

Název práce: The Role of Privacy in Forming the European Union's Normative Power through Regulation

Oponoval (u externích oponentů uveďte též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce): Tomáš Weiss

1. OBSAH A CÍL PRÁCE (stručná informace o práci, formulace cíle):

The thesis by Matěj Hejtmánek focuses on the rise of the EU as a global regulatory power within the sphere of privacy and data protection. The text consists of five parts that are logically ordered and guide the reader from the conceptual issues to the theoretical framework and to the actual analysis of the empirical material. The objective of the thesis is slightly confusing, however. It seems to me that the title of the thesis does not fully match the research question, which, in turn, does not fully match the empirical analysis. One asks about the role of privacy, the other about the role of the rise of technological companies, and the last focuses on the regulations.

2. VĚCNÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (náročnost, tvůrčí přístup, argumentace, logická struktura, teoretické a metodologické ukotvení, práce s prameny a literaturou, vhodnost příloh apod.):

The text follows the standard structure of the thesis format in a logical and transparent manner. It introduces relevant concepts (privacy, normative power Europe, Brussels effect) and follows on with the analysis of the empirical materials. There is, however, a lack of link between the individual sections. The whole part 1 focuses on the academic debate about the concept of privacy. It is very well done but lacks a follow up. What does privacy mean for the thesis and the research? If it does not to be defined, why is the debate about it introduced at all? What is the link between privacy and data protection (which is the actual focus of the thesis)? Are they equivalent or is one a subset of the other? It seems to me that the thesis could have got rid of the first part without losing anything.

Similarly, there is a nice introduction of both normative power Europe and Brussels effect debate in the theoretical section. But first, the rest of the thesis only goes back to the Brussels effect and not the NPE. Why does the text introduce it then? (In fact, it seems to me that the concept of market power Europe may have been more suitable than NPE.) Second, the theories do not seem to inform the methodology at all. There is no clear link between the theory and how the thesis approaches the data.

In fact, the methodological part is rather disappointing. There is no operationalisation to talk of. The author mentions that he would be conducting content analysis and discourse analysis, but no further details or framework of the analysis is introduced. As a result, the empirical part simply overviews the key documents chronologically without a real “analysis” according to set criteria. Also, the text mentions that it uses inductive approach (p. 20) but that is not really true. If anything, the design is more deductive because the thesis looks for traces of the Brussels effect in EU’s data protection regulation and its development. There is no hypothesis/theory in the end which would need to be the result of an inductive approach.

The empirical part introduces the development of data protection legislation in the European Union over time. It is well-written, but it lacks the analytical edge as mentioned above. It is not fully clear how the empirical material was compiled. The short note on p. 21 claiming that the documents were selected “based on their significance” does not shed much light on the process. Also, a significant part of the data comprises declarations of Commissioners or other actors whose selection is not explained at all.

3. FORMÁLNÍ A JAZYKOVÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (jazykový projev, správnost citace a odkazů na literaturu, grafická úprava, formální náležitosti práce apod.):

Formally, the thesis meets all the standards. The text would benefit from additional editing (but that is always the case). Some formulations are slightly confusing, such as “The largest actor in the modern age of information is

undoubtedly the internet.” (p. 7) Sometimes, Czech word order jumps out: “Another possible way in which can policies travel is...” (p. 19).

4. KONTROLA ORIGINALITY TEXTU

Prohlašuji, že jsem se seznámil/a s výsledkem kontroly originality textu závěrečné práce v systému:

Theses Turnitin Ouriginal (Urkund)

Komentář k výsledku kontroly:

Without any problems.

5. STRUČNÝ KOMENTÁŘ HODNOTITELE (celkový dojem z diplomové práce, silné a slabé stránky, originalita myšlenek, naplnění cíle apod.):

This is a thesis on a very interesting topic that, unfortunately, fails to meet the expectations. The individual parts are very interesting and sometimes even very well written (especially the literature review). But they fail to form a coherent whole. A more disciplined analysis would help the thesis provide a more compelling answer to the research question.

6. OTÁZKY A PŘIPOMÍNKY DOPORUČENÉ K BLIŽŠÍMU VYSVĚTLENÍ PŘI OBHAJOBĚ (jedna až tři):

- What could be the hypothesis for future testing that your inductive research may produce?
- Could you discuss to what extent the described extraterritorial impact of the EU regulation is an argument supporting the normative power Europe theory or the market power Europe theory?

7. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA

(A a B výborně, C a D velmi dobře, E dobře, F nevyhověl):

In light of the comments above, I recommend the thesis for the defence and suggest the grade C or D, depending on the conduct of the defence.

Datum: 18. srpna 2022

Podpis:

Pozn.: Hodnocení píše k jednotlivým bodům, pokud nepíšete v textovém editoru, použijte při nedostatku místa zadní stranu nebo příložený list. V hodnocení práce se pokuste oddělit ty její nedostatky, které jsou, podle vašeho mínění, obhajobou neodstranitelné (např. chybí kritické zhodnocení pramenů a literatury), od těch věcí, které student může dobrou obhajobou napravit; poměr těchto dvou položek berte prosím v úvahu při stanovení konečné známky.