



## Master's Thesis Evaluation Form

Student's name: Shivam Sen

Thesis title: Digital Discourse Analysis of Posthumanism in Open Access Academia

Name of the supervisor: doc. Mgr. Martin Hájek, Ph.D.

Name of the opponent: Mgr. Jakub Sedláček, Ph.D.

What are the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis? Please give your reasons for the suggested grade in detail below.

1. *Does the author show understanding of one or more theories, and use theory to generate a hypothesis or to make the problem area more understandable.*

Comments: The author absolutely does show understanding of the theories he works with.

2. *Is the research question articulated clearly and properly? Is the research question sufficiently answered in the conclusion?*

Comments: Research questions are articulated on page 8. Whether their phrasing is ideal considering the methods employed is a different question. I had no idea I was reading an NLP paper until page 24. The only hint was in the title and its phrase "digital discourse analysis". I'm not sure, however, that such a term is sufficiently established that it doesn't require further explanation (from my experience, it can just as well be used to denote the analysis of discourse on digital platforms). Either way, the phrase is only found in the title and nowhere else, and the abstract and/or introduction should provide readers with a better idea of what they can expect.

3. *Is the thesis based on relevant research and literature and does it accurately summarize and integrate the information?*

Comments: Yes. The thesis is grounded very nicely in both theoretical and methodological literature.

4. *What is the quality of the data or the other sources? Are the sample method, data collection and data analysis appropriate?*

Comments: The data (and its collection) is well described and of high quality; the methods used to collect it are (still) relatively innovative. The same is true for data analysis – very well done and quite well described.

5. *Are the findings relevant to the research question? Are the conclusions of the thesis based on strong arguments?*



Comments: We could argue whether e.g., the frequency of nouns can really shed light on “the different constructions of the notion of ‘Post Human’” (RQ1). In my opinion, the thesis would benefit from a more “down to earth” approach when defining research questions and from their much greater operationalization in light of the actual methods used. Even though the concepts of “Statement, Discourse and Discursive Spheres” and “Power and its Configurations” are discussed at great lengths in their respective sections, the reader is left with only a very vague idea of what to expect in the actual research. This unfortunately leads to a sense of disappointment once conclusions about abstract, conceptual ideas start to be drawn based on e.g., the frequency of nouns without first establishing that such a jump makes sense. This doesn’t mean that the findings are wrong, just that their explanatory power related to big concepts should probably be discussed more (and the RQs edited appropriately).

6. *Are the author’s thoughts distinguished unambiguously from the borrowed ideas?*

Comments: Yes, from what I can tell, citations/references are marked clearly. When citing a specific work repeatedly (e.g., Foucault), the author unfortunately doesn’t always provide page numbers.

7. *Is the thesis containing original/innovative research (in terms of topic, approach, and/or findings)?*

Comments: As mentioned before, both the data collection and analysis methods are quite innovative (in the sense that they are not found in the repertoire of a typical master’s student).

8. *What is the quality of style and other formal requirements?*

Comments: Stylistically, the thesis is very good. The language is beautiful, albeit unnecessarily complicated at times, specifically in theoretical chapters summarizing complicated authors (understandable). Chapters lack numbering.

9. *Are there any other strengths and weaknesses of the thesis, which are not included in the previous questions? Please list them if any.*

Comments: Some visualizations would require additional work (e.g., Fig. 2.1 on p. 41 serves no real purpose to the reader).

10. *What topic do you suggest for the discussion in the thesis defence?*

Comments: If possible, further clarifying how and why the data/methods can be used to answer the proposed research questions. If not, proposing a possible alternative set of research questions (subquestions) suitable for the data/methods.

11. *Declaration that the supervisor has read the result of the originality check in the system: [ ] Theses [ ] Turnitin [ ] Original (Urkund)*

Supervisor's comment on the originality check result:



Overall assessment of the thesis:

The thesis is very well written and uses interesting methods on good data. My biggest problem with it is the aforementioned disconnect between big questions and the (understandably) relatively simple answers actually available in the data. Once again, these “simple” answers are valuable in their own right, but would likely work better with a different set of questions. The thesis is recommended for defence with a proposed grade of C (potentially B in case of a very good defence).

*(Please, state clearly whether the thesis is or is not recommended for a defence and write the main reasons for the recommendation).*

Proposed grade: C

*(A- B: excellent, C-D: very good, E: good, F: fail)*

Date: 9. 6. 2023

Signature: