



## Posudek na diplomovou práci

Autor/ka práce: Filip Mocák

Název práce: A comprehensive analysis of integration of EU energy markets and aspects affecting the process of integration between 2000 and 2019

Obor/Rok: BS 2021

Autor posudku (oponent): Jan Mazač

| Kritéria                 | Definice                            | Max. bodů  | Získané body |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| <b>Hlavní kritéria</b>   |                                     |            |              |
|                          | Výzkumná otázka, formulace problému | <b>10</b>  | 7            |
|                          | Teoretický konceptuální rámec       | <b>30</b>  | 20           |
|                          | Metodologie, analýza argumentace    | <b>40</b>  | 28           |
| <i>Celkem</i>            |                                     | <b>80</b>  | 55           |
| <b>Vedlejší kritéria</b> |                                     |            |              |
|                          | Zdroje                              | <b>10</b>  | 5            |
|                          | Styl                                | <b>5</b>   | 4            |
|                          | Formální kritéria                   | <b>5</b>   | 5            |
| <i>Celkem</i>            |                                     | <b>20</b>  | 14           |
| <b>CELKEM</b>            |                                     | <b>100</b> | 69           |



## Slovní hodnocení:

### Hlavní kritéria:

The Thesis purpose is to analyse the integration of the European Union (EU) gas market from 2000 to 2019. The author uses interpretative content analysis of legal acts and other documents adopted or published by the European Commission and attempts to elucidate aspects that impacted the integration of the EU gas market. Overall, I find the topic very relevant and the master's thesis itself promising. The thesis and its parts correspond with the requirements. However, it contains many deficiencies. Therefore, I apply a sizable penalty as described below.

Regarding objectives, I lack their clear definition. Formulation of research questions (RQ) and hypotheses should be more precise and comprehensible to a reader. First, in the RQ1, the author asks whether the Member States accepted initiatives and ambitions proposed by the European Commission. Focusing on the Member States establishes the sense that the author intends to analyse documents adopted by special legislative procedure only, where the Council is the sole legislator. However, in the hypothesis 1 (which should provide a direct answer to this RQ1), the author speaks about implementation in legislative and non-legislative acts. Therefore, as regards legislative acts, adapted not only by Member States as written in RQ1 but also by the European Parliament (under the ordinary legislative procedure). Second, hypothesis 4 seems redundant. What the assumption states is quite apparent. If European legislation is not sufficiently transposed into national legislation, the intended outcome cannot be achieved. There is no need to test it. To sum up, I understand what the author sets out to answer. However, since RQs are essential elements of any inquiry, anchoring the whole project, I would expect their clearer framing, clearer connection with hypotheses, and use of better-defined concepts. E.g., taken on board by the Member States vs. implemented in respective legislative/non-legislative acts; or how does the author define non-legislative acts? What type of documents does this category contain?

The theoretical underpinning is very brief and weak. It is unclear why theoretical reflections (Neofunctionalism, Liberal Intergovernmentalism, and MLG) of European integration are even mentioned since none of their theoretical expectations are further used/tested in the project (e.g., as a basis for hypotheses formulation). On the other hand, conceptualization is sufficient, and the key concept, the internal energy market, is thoroughly defined. The author also focuses on the term energy poverty. Unfortunately, the author omits to explain other essential terms/concepts further used in the thesis. I would appreciate the conceptualization of distinct legal acts or the ambiguously used term implementation.



**FAKULTA  
SOCIÁLNÍCH VĚD**  
Univerzita Karlova

Regarding the method used, the author decided to base his research on interpretative content analysis to develop subjective meanings latently hidden in selected documents.

Unfortunately, a description of a selection of documents is fuzzy, e.g., on p. 18, the author acknowledges he chooses (inter alia) legislative acts or directives for assessment (it does not make sense since directive is a type of EU legislative acts). On p. 18, the author mentions that green papers, directives, and strategies will be analysed, but actually, regulations are also under his study. Therefore, although it is obvious further in the empirical part what types of documents are under review, I would suggest being more precise when describing how data are selected and collected as it makes the whole thesis more comprehensible. I also miss the transparency on data operationalization and validation as it is an essential element of any content analysis. Otherwise, it is challenging to make replicable and valid inferences, as the author states on p. 15.

The analytical chapter is the most substantial part of the thesis. It is robust, well-structured, and logically organised, enabling it to keep pace with a great deal of EU legal acts and other documents under study. However, even in this part, I identify some issues. First, on p. 30, an average natural gas price is not per cubic meter but MBtu (natural gas is never charged per cubic meter since its composition might have a different calorific value). Besides, the author refers to Henry Hub; therefore, to the US market-based benchmark, not the European (e.g., Dutch TTF or UK NBP). Although there is a trend towards more market-based pricing, most EU import contracts still use price indices linked to oil derivatives (see COM(2006)851, also analysed by the author in the thesis). Second, chapter 4.2.3 is devoted to COM(2006)841, not COM(2008)782. Therefore, its title is wrong. Finally, in the concluding chapter on p. 57-58, the author claims that the correlation between political conflicts in the EU neighbourhood and the integration of energy markets has not been found. Using statistics for which a large observation is needed in combination with interpretative methods is quite unorthodox. Besides, since no quantitative data were collected, the author cannot determine the amount of variance in the dependent variable brought about by a change in the independent variable (Pearson coefficient/R-squared) and whether this relationship is statistically significant (P-value).

**Vedlejší kritéria:**

The thesis is well-formatted and structured and corresponds with the requirements. The writing style and grammar (with some exceptions) are satisfactory. However, the author's work with referencing is insufficient. There are whole paragraphs where the author uses the information without including citation pointing to the source (e.g., p. 8, second and fourth paragraph). Besides, on p. 45, 47-49, there are two in-text citations (European Commission, 2011 and European Commission, 2014); however, there are two corresponding entries in the reference list for each.



FAKULTA  
SOCIÁLNÍCH VĚD  
Univerzita Karlova

Better proofreading would avoid these errors.

Celkové hodnocení:

Overall, and despite some issues I identified, I find the topic very relevant and the master's thesis itself promising. The thesis and its parts correspond with the requirements. I also appreciate that the author explicitly acknowledges and lists the limitations of his study. However, as described above, the thesis contains many severe formal and factual deficiencies.

Výsledná známka: D

Podpis:

Jan Mazač