

Name of the student:	Arpi Muradyan
Title of the thesis:	Diaspora as a Public Diplomacy Agent: A Comparative Case Study on Armenian Communities in Italy and Poland
Reviewer:	Dr hab. Magdalena Góra

### **1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD**

(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

The student is analysing the role of the diaspora in public diplomacy based on a case of Armenian diasporas in Poland and Italy. In addition, the major arena where these activities are analysed is social media, a fairly novel but capacitating non state actors. This tackles the important and not sufficiently researched theme of role of non-governmental actors in public diplomacy reserved mostly for state-based actors. The research questions are valid and relevant. They focus on what elements of public diplomacy are used by the organisations in focus. However, the research questions are rather descriptive, and the comparative element is not fully reflected in the research questions. Ultimately however, the research focus is narrowed down to two diaspora actors activities in formal social media channels making it empirically rather shallow and not sufficient to fully answer the questions.

The student possesses very good overview of the mechanisms of public diplomacy and literature of the topic as well as she is quite fluent in historical background of the communities in question.

Theoretically, author selected proper approach to analyse the activities of selected diaspora groups along the taxonomy combining two key approaches of researching public diplomacy. The literature review seems to be sufficient and very well presented in a concise and analytical form.

### **2. ANALYSIS**

(methodology, argument, theoretical backing, appropriate work with sources):

Arpi decided to employ very limited approach to study a chosen topic focusing on social media activities of the two diasporas in Poland and Italy. The main strength of the thesis is the good and sufficiently researched background case as well as good theoretical frame. The main limitation is the limited empirical material since the social media channels are not stepping beyond a very typical type of communication with host (rather limited) audience. In addition, the methodology that was chosen limited a potential that this thesis has. Looking only on that official communication did not provide any novel insights into the diaspora actorness in public diplomacy. In addition, none of the links with kinstate and coordination was possible to be revealed. Finally, it is hard to understand any reason for that specific case studies – other than Personal links of a student which is relevant but not sufficient for justifying the selection.

The empirical part is correctly structured but it gives the impression that the material was limited since a (over) use of visual evidence that is illustrative but not very revealing. Overall, empirical analysis is descriptive even if informative. The comparative angle is also underplayed and lost in the detailed accounts of specific types of communication by the organizations in question.

### **3. CONCLUSIONS**

(persuasiveness, link between data and conclusions, achievement of research objectives):

The conclusions are correctly written linking the results with theoretical background of the thesis. There are attempts by the student to advance discussion on the role of diasporas in public diplomacy and mapping future avenues of research,

#### 4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE

(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

The language of the thesis is correct. The layout of the thesis is proper and clear. Citations, use of sources and bibliography is correctly applied.

#### 5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

I assess Arpi's knowledge of the case study of Armenian diasporas in Italy and Poland very high. The thesis strength is coming from that background knowledge. As well as from good orientation in theoretical literature on public diplomacy. The key weakness of the thesis is that it has a rather limited empirical data (massive in numbers but not very revealing). As a result, the thesis is rather descriptive and the comparative dimension that seemed as a strength was not exactly helping with getting more analytical approach. However, even the limited findings that the student presented are already significant and interesting for the future research on diasporas and their role in public diplomacy.

<b>Grade (A-F):</b>	C+
Date: 12/09/2022	Signature: Magdalena Góra

classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
	91-100 %	8,5%	5	6,7%	8,5-10	5,3%	9-10	5,5 %
B (81-90)	81-90 %	16,3%	4,5	11,7%	7,5-8,4	16,4%	8-8,9	11,0 %
C (71-80)	71-80 %	16,3%	4	20%	6,5-7,4	36,2%	7-7,9	18,4 %
D (61-70)	61-70 %	24%	3,5	28,3%			6-6,9	35,2 %
E (51-60)	51-60 %	34,9%	3	33,4 %	6-6,4	42,1 %	5-5,9	30,1 %

**Assessment criteria:**

Excellent (A): 'Outstanding performance with only minor errors';

Very good (B): 'Above the average standard but with some errors';

Good (C): 'Generally sound work but with a number of notable errors';

Satisfactory (D): 'Fair but with significant shortcomings';

Sufficient (E): 'Performance meets the minimum criteria';

Fail: 'Some/considerable more work required before the credit can be awarded'.