

Report of External Examiner
Lucia Najšlová, PhD., Institute for European Policy EUROPEUM
Submitted regarding the
MA Thesis of Dominika Dražilová presented to defense at Charles university,
Prague

The author has selected a relevant and interesting topic, and has demonstrated a fairly good level of acquaintance with secondary sources. Despite a number of methodological flaws listed below I recommend the thesis to defense. In case of successful defense, the candidate should be awarded grade B (2).

- 1) The author has not shown familiarity with key EU documents related to Turkey's EU accession; this is obvious especially in cases, where information related to proceedings of EU institutions is cited/quoted from secondary source. An MA thesis should draw on more primary sources.
- 2) I find it imprecise to use terms EU and Europe interchangeably and the arguments the author presents to defend this insufficient. In an academic work, it is of utmost importance to differentiate between categories of analysis and categories of practice. Thus, the very fact, that the EU policy-makers (practitioners) often use the terms EU/Europe interchangeably does not mean, that an analyst should/can make the same simplification. 'Europe' is a contested term – something the author herself clearly shows, while the EU is a structure that can be clearly defined (i.e. in terms of geography, membership etc.).
- 3) The thesis is more descriptive than analytical. Moreover, a number of quotes are too long and it is not clear why the author chose to quote instead of paraphrasing and analyzing the arguments presented by quoted scholars. Thus, to a large extent, the thesis is a good summary of literature and sources, yet, without much author's original input.
- 4) The author does not sufficiently explain the selection of case studies (UK, FR, GER). In general, the method is the weakest part of the presented thesis – it is not clear how the author arrived to a typology of concepts of Europe – it seems as if the selection of politics, geography, history and economic potential was ad hoc. Moreover, although the author tries to fit the selected case studies into pre-selected 'boxes' of concepts of Europe (historical/economic etc.) in the final chapter, the evidence presented in earlier parts of the thesis does not fully support her classification.
- 5) In general, the author seems to be unaware of methods of discourse analysis in IR, especially of the fact, that in order to understand 'concept' or 'framing' of Europe (or of anything else), one needs to go beyond speech analysis, and focus on action (policies, laws, etc.) as well.

Prague, June 20, 2012