



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

Academic year: 2023/2024

Student's name and surname: László Kránitz
Student's ID: 44410990

Type of the study programme: Master's (post-Bachelor)
Study programme: International Relations
Study ID: 756122

Title of the thesis: Political level cooperation between Visegrad countries: factors and narratives
Thesis department: Department of International Relations (23-KMV)
Language of the thesis: English
Language of defence: English
Advisor: Mgr. Viera Martinková, Ph.D.
Reviewer(s): PhDr. Irah Kučerová, Ph.D.
Date of defence: 11.09.2024 **Venue of defence:** Praha
Attempt: regular

Course of the examination: Student presented thesis about potential Visegrad identity. Student wanted to find why Visegrad countries changed stances after 2015 migration crisis. Student tried to analyse change with certain identity, whether it really exists. Student used constructivism to try to find answers where Visegrad identity exists. Student mentioned methodology of critical discourse analysis. Student mentioned construction of power within society. Student presented structure of thesis, first part presentation as defenders of people, second part which norms diffused among society, third part try to find emotional justification to identity. Student mentioned that results were vague, but believe that countries succeeded in creating Visegrad identity, that people living in these countries are proud of their identity, that EU shifting more toward supranational from intergovernmental. Supervisor mentioned that student started with conclusion and then tried to prove it, that there are some assumptions that thesis does not explain, such as that there is collective identity, claim of migration crisis as critical juncture without justification, end period in 2022 ignore differences in Visegrad countries, ignore changes in governments and how that impacted claims, and whether this is in line with constructivism, and that analysis is not proper discourse analysis, just cherry-picking quotes that fit argument, that student only quotes particular politicians, and ignores representatives of other political parties, and gives biased picture, supervisor gave grade of E. Committee mentioned that second reader converges with supervisor, that formulation of research questions presupposes opinions, and that analysis does not support it, that results do not fully correspond to original intentions, selection of representatives not clear, that thesis has very subjective impression, too unclear topic of Visegrad identity, that data seems to be purposefully selected,

suggested grade of D. Student mentioned that according to constructivism states start cooperating and develop shared identity, and that Visegrad countries have been cooperating for many years, that belonging to Central Europe exists. Committee highlights bias of data in thesis. Student mentioned try to use socio-cognitive elements of critical discourse analysis, loss of sovereignty. Student mentioned EU trying to shift to supranational, federalisation of EU, that selected leaders try to push against it. Student acknowledged cherrypicking of leaders for analysis. Student claimed that certain politicians won elections. Student included some critical parts, mayors of 4 capitals, who were all opposition leaders, who argued that Visegrad region belongs to West, should follow Brussels and EU. Committee mentioned that perhaps present results/thesis as efforts to construct identity, rather than actual Visegrad identity. Student mentioned that look at process of formation of Visegrad identity, could legitimise that process started, that people can have multiple identities, that national identities completely shift, that identities compete and coexist, that national identities of nations don't contradict regional identity that much. Student agrees that should have gone deeper. Committee asked which languages used. Student mentioned used English and Hungarian, and translation softwares.

Result of defence: good (E)

Chair of the board: Karlas Jan, doc. PhDr., Ph.D., M.A. (present)

Committee members: Kazharski Aliaksei, Ph.D. (present)

Martinková Viera, Mgr., Ph.D. (present)