

REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

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

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Title of the thesis: | Montenegro's accession to European Union |
| Author of the thesis: | Mijo Ivanović |
| Referee (incl. titles): | PhDr. Zuzana Kasáková, Ph.D. |

Remark: It is a standard at the FSV UK that the Referee's Report is at least 500 words long. In case you will assess the thesis as "non-defendable", please explain the concrete reasons for that in detail.

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

| CATEGORY | POINTS |
|---|---------------|
| <i>Theoretical background (max. 20)</i> | 0 |
| <i>Contribution (max. 20)</i> | 5 |
| <i>Methods (max. 20)</i> | 2 |
| <i>Literature (max. 20)</i> | 5 |
| <i>Manuscript form (max. 20)</i> | 5 |
| TOTAL POINTS (max. 100) | 17 |
| The proposed grade (1-2-3-4) | 4 |

You can even use a decimal point (e.g. giving the grade of 2.5 for 60 points).

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 does not include any theoretical background. This type of academic work has to be written within appropriate research framework consisting of state of art analysis, theoretical fundamentals, relevant research criteria and methodology. Unfortunately, author does not offer any theoretical perspective to approach his topic as well as relevant research criteria, and state of art analysis. Methodology is mentioned in a very limited way.

2) Contribution:

The question chosen for the thesis is very interesting and topical, but very broadly formulated. It would be much better to make it more specific and provide in-depth research. Instead of comprehensive and profound analysis, author limits his contribution to the description of EU enlargement process, documents, etc. He also uses bullet points to summarize (p. 26) or list main points (pp. 42-43). Together with some text being in italics and making recommendations (again in bullet points) in the conclusion, the text reminds policy paper rather than academic writing the master thesis should be based on.

One can also ask about the relevance of short history of the European integration process presented in chapter one.

3) Methods:

The author indicates that the thesis should be "based on a complete analysis of EU integration process" (p. 7). Such statement only reflects above-mentioned very broad approach to the topic. Although he lists points within SWOT analysis, he does not work with them much later, i.e. there is no in-depth analysis of the problem. The thesis lacks any hypothesis testing based on theoretical explanations using relevant analytical tools.

4) Literature:

The author commanded recent and relevant primary and secondary sources. However, the analysis of them is very limited (just one paragraph in the Introduction), not to speak about state of art analysis, which is non-existent. Unfortunately, the author was not able to sort out relevant sources. He puts primary sources into the section of secondary sources and vice versa. He does not always quote relevant sources in a proper way either: between the pages 33 and 53 there are no quotations at all (although some documents are mentioned in the text, they should be quoted accordingly), internet sources lack date of accession (pp. 29-30, 32, 58), and the direct speech or numbers are not always quoted (pp. 12, 15, 56).

5) Manuscript form:

The thesis is structured accordingly. However, the author should use academic language and style of writing.

DATE OF EVALUATION: 26. 1. 2015

Referee Signature

The referee should give comments to the following requirements:

1) THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: Can you recognize that the thesis was guided by some **theoretical fundamentals** relevant for this thesis topic? Were some important theoretical concepts omitted? Was the theory used in the thesis consistently incorporated with the topic and hypotheses tested?

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

2) CONTRIBUTION: Evaluate if the author presents **original ideas** on the topic and aims at demonstrating **critical thinking** and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and relevant empirical material. Is there a distinct **value added** of the thesis (relative to knowledge of a university-educated person interested in given topic)? Did the author explain **why** the observed phenomena occurred? Were the policy implications well founded?

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

3) METHODS: Are the **hypotheses** for this study clearly stated, allowing their further verification and testing? Are the theoretical explanations, empirical material and **analytical tools** used in the thesis relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the aspiration level of the study? Is the thesis **topic comprehensively analyzed** and does the thesis not make trivial or irrelevant detours off the main body stated in the thesis proposal? More than 10 points signal an exceptional work, **which requires your explanation "why" it is so**.

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

4) LITERATURE REVIEW: The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and **command of recent literature**. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way and disposes with a representative bibliography. (Remark: references to Wikipedia, websites and newspaper articles are a sign of **poor research**). If they dominate you cannot give more than 8 points. References to books published by prestigious publishers and articles in renowned journals give much better impression.

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

5) MANUSCRIPT FORM: The thesis is **clear and well structured**. The author uses appropriate language and style, including academic **format** for quotations, graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables, is easily readable and **stimulates thinking**.

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

| TOTAL POINTS | GRADE | Czech grading | US grading |
|--------------|----------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| 81 – 100 | 1 | = excellent | = A |
| 61 – 80 | 2 | = good | = B |
| 51 – 60 | 3 | = satisfactory | = C |
| 41 – 50 | 3 | = satisfactory | = D |
| 0 – 40 | 4 | = fail | = not recommended for defence |