



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Bc. Tereza Nečasová

Title: : Criteria of selection of the European Commissioners

Programme/year: International Relations/SS 2021

Author of Evaluation (external assessor): doc. PhDr. Běla Plechanovová, CSc.

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	10	6
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	30	21
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	30
<i>Total</i>		80	57
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	10
	Style	5	4
	Formal requirements	5	3
<i>Total</i>		20	14
TOTAL		100	74



Evaluation

Major criteria:

The thesis addresses an important topic of criteria for nominations of members of the European Commission. The Author aims to find what criteria member states apply when nominating the member of the European Commission.

While the topic is relevant and intriguing, there is already a significant bulk of literature dealing with the issue of relationship between the member states and members of the Commission. Contrary to what the Author presents as an alternative perception of the Commissioner's role as an independent servant to the interests of the European Union (p. 17), this is not considered as a viable hypothesis by this literature. The Author aims to contribute to the topic by applying the principal-agent theory in contrast with the concept of credible commitment thesis. This research design as defined by the hypotheses in my opinion suffers from two omissions. First, the timeframe for the analysis is divided in 2009 by Lisbon Treaty which changed the procedure of appointment of the Commission in several aspects, mainly the role of the designated President was enhanced considerably in the process of nomination of the members of the college, as well as that the President her/himself is supposed to be chosen based on the results of the EP elections. It is reasonable to assume that the approach of the member states may change as a result. Second, the assumption that "new member states tend to nominate higher ranking officials with European experience" (H2) is *contradictio in adjecto*, in my opinion, as new member states do not have high ranking officials with European experience, for sure not in length commensurable with officials from the old member states.

There are some theoretical and conceptual problems connected with the framing of the research design of the work. The principal-agent theory assumes that there is some way how to confirm that the agent really serves the principal. The Author does not deal with any kind of tests that would confirm this claim when deciding on attaching the particular code to the particular commissioner.

The analysis in the case studies is rather shallow, omitting eventually factors that should be relevant for coding of particular commissioners, e.g., in case of Michel Barnier leaving out a number of roles he played in European politics before his nomination (namely Action Committee for European Democracy, next to others).



**FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
Charles University

Minor criteria:

The scope of resources used is adequate. The style and language are in general also adequate, but the text would benefit from more attentive editing as the number of typos is not negligible, and more importantly, there are factual errors in the text as a result of omissions (e.g., Portugal instead of Poland, p. 22; European Parliament instead of European Commission, p. 40). The thesis lacks app. 7 percent to the minimal length of the master's thesis as defined by the regulation.

Overall evaluation:

The thesis presents the topic in concise manner with clearly defined structure as well as the method. The arguments for framing of the research design are nevertheless rather weak as well as the analysis in the case studies section.

Suggested grade: C