

Joint Dissertation Review

Name of the student:	Ines Trabelsi
Title of the thesis:	The Gap between Policy and Practice: Dublin Regulation III in Post-Overburdened Italy
Reviewer:	Joost Augusteijn, Leiden University

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD

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

The research question is well framed, extremely relevant and clear. There is a clear research objective which tends to much to a policy advise or consultancy document rather than an academic analysis. The literature review is however very strong, and shows a great awareness of what is out there.

2. ANALYSIS

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

The methodology is very-well described and supported in the theory with a strong realisation of its limitations. The knowledge and understanding of the theoretical approaches taken in the effectiveness of asylum policies is impressive, and the diversity of it is well set out.

The approach is logical and based on the theoretical works. The argument is therefore clearly structured in the approach taken. Despite the realisation of the limitations there are serious short-comings in the source material that the research is based on. The almost exclusive reliance on interviews with twelve anonymous respondents is methodologically problematic, and unsatisfactory, even if there is a good realisation of its limitations. As a result the evidence for the points made is weak, and comments by the respondents seem to function largely as an illustration to the general argument of failure of execution of regulations and an inability to correct this.

3. CONCLUSIONS

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

In the end the logical structure of the thesis and the straightforward analysis makes for a consistent line of argument. As mentioned above the use of interviews as the primary source of information has its problems and also makes the outcome of the research itself somewhat unsatisfactory. The research objective to find out why Italy does not comply with the Dublin regulations is only superficially answered. The author never overstates what can be concluded, so that is well-done but the approach taken could have been adjusted to enable a more satisfactory outcome.

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE

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

In itself the thesis is clearly and logically structured, well annotated and laid out. It does lack a certain amount of guidance for the reader in making clear what the thesis is doing. In particular the introduction lacks clarity. This is not helped by a certain deficiency in the use of the English.

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

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

The thesis is very-well contextualised in the academic debate and theoretical discussion, which is translated in a in itself well founded methodology which is also clearly accounted for. At the abstract level there is a good awareness of the limitations of the conclusions that can be drawn, and what is done is well executed.

The thesis suffers a bit in its reliance on interviews in the research part and the attempt to be both an academic analysis and a policy advise paper.

Grade (A-F):	8- Dutch terms = B in Czech terms
Date: 121 June 2019	Signature: 