

REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

IEPS – International Economic and Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Title of the thesis:	Supranational and Intergovernmental Approach to the Accession Process of Montenegro to the European Union
Author of the thesis:	Marek Kopanický
Referee (incl. titles):	doc. Mgr. Tomáš Weiss, M.A., Ph.D.

Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the 5 numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).

1) Theoretical background: The thesis is anchored in a classical dichotomy in EU studies, namely the question whether it is the nation states or the EU institutions that drive politics at the EU level. The answer clearly is that it is a mix of the two, but that does not make it less relevant to identify the two ideal approaches. The presentation of the two approaches is extensive, bordering too long as these are well-known issues omnipresent in the literature. The research question is, however, clearly founded and makes sense.

2) Contribution: The introductory chapters of the thesis are somewhat too extensive. While I understand the need to substantiate the research question and approach in the literature, the presentation could have been shorter and more concise, focusing on the distinctive features and not on EU trivia. Nevertheless, the original part, which analyses the two selected negotiation chapters between the EU and Montenegro, is clear, based on primary sources and provides a persuasive rebuttal of the proposed hypotheses. Thus, the thesis fulfils the stated contribution to trace (or rather in this case no to trace) the parallels between the internal organization of EU policies and their reflection in the accession negotiations. The conclusions are not trivial.

3) Methods: The methods are clearly stated and explained. The selection of the cases – both the country and the chapters – makes sense. The sources are relevant, include primary sources, and even several interviews with stakeholders, which help interpret the written materials.

4) Literature: List of references is extensive. It includes relevant literature as well as EU documents. The thesis could have discussed the importance of the conclusion for the literature in more detail.

5) Manuscript form: The form corresponds with the level of the master thesis at FSV UK. Some parts could have been written more concisely, but the language is understandable and sufficiently clear (as far as I can tell).

Box for the thesis supervisor only. Please characterize the progress in the working out of thesis (e.g. steady and gradual versus discontinuous and abrupt) and the level (intensity) of communication/cooperation with the author:

The author was in a constant contact with me. Having started with a very vague idea, he was able to reflect on my suggestions and criticism and to streamline the research into a more coherent and cohesive thesis.

Suggested questions for the defence are:

1. What do the results suggest for the general debate on the role of the EU institutions vs. the member states in the integration process?
2. Should the EU's focus on good governance and rule of law be interpreted as a general feature of the accession process, or rather as a specific approach towards Balkan countries?

I recommend the thesis for final defence. I recommend the following grade: “C”.

SUMMARY OF POINTS AWARDED (for details, see below):

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Theoretical background (max. 20)</i>	16
<i>Contribution (max. 20)</i>	15
<i>Methods (max. 20)</i>	14
<i>Literature (max. 20)</i>	14
<i>Manuscript form (max. 20)</i>	18
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100)	77
The proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F)	C

DATE OF EVALUATION: 4 June 2019

Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Level of performance
91 – 100	A	= outstanding (high honour)
81 – 90	B	= superior (honour)
71 – 80	C	= good
61 – 70	D	= satisfactory
51 – 60	E	= low pass
50 – 0	F	= failure. Thesis is then not recommended for defence.