

Name of the student:	Nadia Al-Kabariti
Title of the thesis:	EU External Cultural Policies: A Case Study of Jordan
Reviewer:	Ewa Szczepankiewicz-Rudzka

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD

(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

The thesis analyzes cultural cooperation between the European Union and third countries, focusing specifically on Jordan as a case study. It explores the historical context of cultural cooperation in European integration, its role in internal forums, and its significance in EU foreign policy cooperation. Additionally, the study examines the EU's relations with third countries in the Mediterranean region, with particular attention given to Jordan. The research objectives, as outlined on pages 4-5 of the thesis, can be summarized into four points:

1. Explore the dynamics of EU cultural policies.
2. Provide a comprehensive understanding of the current state of EU cultural policies in Jordan.
3. Analyze the implementation of these policies through programs and initiatives by both the EU and member states (specifically Germany and France).
4. Assess the impact of Brexit on British cultural policies in Jordan.

The research assumptions are well-constructed, and the thesis's structure is logical, effectively serving the research objectives. The author has conducted a thorough literature review to achieve the study's research aims.

2. ANALYSIS

(methodology, argument, theoretical backing, appropriate work with sources):

The theoretical and methodological aspects of the thesis are presented in the first chapter, which includes insightful discussions on the concepts of soft power, culture, and international cultural cooperation. A significant portion is dedicated to Joseph Nye's theory of soft/normative power, which frames the EU's actions extending beyond traditional trade and political relations, emphasizing the promotion of values and cultural cooperation. The thesis primarily employs historical analysis and systems analysis, drawing on both primary and secondary sources. The bibliography has been selected and utilized appropriately to achieve the research objectives. The majority of sources are in English, with a few in Arabic.

3. CONCLUSIONS

(persuasiveness, link between data and conclusions, achievement of research objectives):

From the perspective of the research problem, Chapter 4 is particularly interesting. It reviews selected cultural projects implemented in Jordan by the European Communities and the most active countries in this regard: Germany and France. The inclusion of cooperation with the United Kingdom, which has not been a member of the EU since 2020, adds an interesting dimension to the analysis.

The conclusion is particularly noteworthy for its contribution to the research objectives. It not only highlights the findings of the thesis but also addresses the weaknesses and challenges of cultural cooperation policies, such as the lack of a rigorous definition of culture, which complicates the categorization of EU actions into development, political, or cultural cooperation. Furthermore, the lack of clear indicators to measure the effectiveness of cultural cooperation presents a challenge, particularly due to the specific nature of cultural initiatives, which complicates the assessment of their short-term results.

The research objectives have been largely achieved. However, there is some dissatisfaction with the lack of statistical analysis regarding the amount of support within the implemented programs and a comparison of cooperation areas within France and Germany. Indicating the evolution of cultural programs over time, with detailed information on the financing of cultural programs and preferred areas of cooperation, would have allowed for a more thorough achievement of the objective of "understanding the dynamics of cultural cooperation with Jordan and the changing landscape of cultural policies" of the EU and its chosen member states.

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE

(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

The structure of the thesis is well-organized, the argumentation is logical, and there are no major issues in terms of editorial aspects.

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

The thesis explores a topic that is not widely studied in academic literature. While theoretical aspects of EU cultural policy in international relations are well-researched, practical applications outside the EU's internal framework are rarely analyzed. This gap means there is limited information beyond basic program documents about how these cultural policies operate in practice. The author deserves recognition for addressing this gap in the reviewed thesis, demonstrating originality at the master's level.

However, the lack of secondary studies on the subject, limited access to program documents for initiatives involving third countries, and minimal reporting in this area have impacted the quality of the analysis. Consequently, the sections of the thesis dealing with the practical aspects of cultural cooperation are more descriptive and less analytical and comparative.

This poses a disadvantage as not all research objectives, such as „capturing the dynamics and changing landscape of cooperation, could be fully achieved.

Despite these shortcomings, the thesis has been generally well-received. The originality of the topic and its solid theoretical foundation compensate for some of the weaknesses in depth of analysis.

Grade (A-F):	B
Date: 10.07.2024	Signature:
	Ewa Szczepankiewicz

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
	91-100 %	8,5%	5	6,7%	8,5-10	5,3%	9-10	5,5 %
B (81-90)	81-90 %	16,3%	4,5	11,7%	7,5-8,4	16,4%	8-8,9	11,0 %
C (71-80)	71-80 %	16,3%	4	20%	6,5-7,4	36,2%	7-7,9	18,4 %
D (61-70)	61-70 %	24%	3,5	28,3%			6-6,9	35,2 %
E (51-60)	51-60 %	34,9%	3	33,4 %	6-6,4	42,1 %	5-5,9	30,1 %

Assessment criteria:

Excellent (A): 'Outstanding performance with only minor errors';

Very good (B): 'Above the average standard but with some errors';

Good (C): 'Generally sound work but with a number of notable errors';

Satisfactory (D): 'Fair but with significant shortcomings';

Sufficient (E): 'Performance meets the minimum criteria';

Fail: 'Some/considerable more work required before the credit can be awarded'.