

Uniwersytet Jagielloński w Krakowie  
Instytut Studiów Europejskich

**dr Karolina Czerska-Shaw**

Egzamin dyplomowy przewiduje się w dniu 02.12.2022 r.  
Kierownik Jednostki Dydaktycznej

### OCENA PRACY DYPLOMOWEJ

Autor: **Patxi Abarzuza Garciandia**  
Numer albumu: **1180162**  
Tytuł pracy: **Identifying Securitising Dynamics in Discourse and Practice: The Handling of Asylum applications in the Context of the 2015 “Refugee Crisis”**  
Tytuł pracy w j. pol.: Identyfikacja dynamiki sekurytyzacji w dyskursie i praktyce: rozpatrywanie wniosków o azyl w kontekście „kryzysu uchodźczego” z 2015 r.  
Kierujący pracą: dr Karolina Czerska-Shaw  
Miejsce napisania pracy: Instytut Studiów Europejskich, Wydział Studiów Międzynarodowych i Politycznych, Uniwersytet Jagielloński w Krakowie  
Program studiów: (WSMP-E317D-2SO) European Politics and Society (Praga), stacjonarne drugiego stopnia  
Seminarium dyplomowe:  
Słowa kluczowe: Securitisation – “Refugee crisis” – European Union – Refugees and Asylum-seekers  
Ocena: 4 (dobry)  
Średnia ważona dla pytań zamkniętych: 3,84  
Suma punktów z pytań zamkniętych: 61,5

### THESIS STRUCTURE:

- 1. How well was the research problem defined?**  
[Wartość 3,5 z wagą 1] Satisfactory Plus
- 2. How well does the content of the thesis fit the research question?**  
[Wartość 3,5 z wagą 1] Satisfactory Plus
- 3. Assessment of thesis structure (organisation of content, order of chapters, completeness of content).**  
[Wartość 4 z wagą 1] Good
- 4. Assessment of the student's awareness of the theoretical context of the topic**  
[Wartość 4,5 z wagą 1] Good Plus
- 5. Assessment of the cohesion and clarity of the conceptualisation of the thesis**  
[Wartość 3,5 z wagą 1] Satisfactory Plus
- 6. Assessment of the empirical context**  
[Wartość 3,5 z wagą 1] Satisfactory Plus
- 7. Assessment of the analytical dimension of the thesis**  
[Wartość 3,5 z wagą 1] Satisfactory Plus
- 8. Assessment of the critical dimension of the thesis**  
[Wartość 4 z wagą 1] Good
- 9. To what extent are the hypotheses formulated in the thesis original?**  
[Wartość 3,5 z wagą 1] Satisfactory Plus

### SOURCES AND THEIR USAGE:

- 10. How rich and varied were the sources/data used?**  
[Wartość 4 z wagą 1] Good
- 11. How appropriate was the use of sources/data in the text?**  
[Wartość 3,5 z wagą 1] Satisfactory Plus

### TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS OF THE THESIS:

**12. Assessment of the readability of the thesis**

[Wartość 4 z wagą 1] Good

**13. To what extent did the text use proper punctuation?**

[Wartość 4 z wagą 1] Good

**14. To what extent did the text use proper grammar and spelling?**

[Wartość 4,5 z wagą 1] Good Plus

**15. Assessment of the completeness of the bibliography**

[Wartość 4 z wagą 1] Good

**16. Assessment of the student's ability to cite sources**

[Wartość 4 z wagą 1] Good

**COMMENTS:****17. Comments (minimum 900 characters)**

The thesis takes on an important subject, yet one that has been the topic of much discussion and academic analysis, therefore here we do not seem to see much novelty in it. What is rather surprising is that the author does not contextualise the 'refugee crisis' and accompanying developments in EU asylum policy further than 2018, while there has undoubtedly been a paradigm shift in the last year. As the thesis was started in 2022, it is not understandable that there is absolutely no mention of the current state of affairs, although words like 'current' and 'recent' are used throughout (in relation to the refugee crisis of 2015-17). Further, in the descriptive analysis of the development of EU asylum policies, and particularly the Dublin Regulations, there is no discussion on the New Pact on Migration and Asylum (proposed already in 2020), that sets out to completely overhaul the system. Data on 'recent' or 'current' refugee populations seems to stop at 2018/19.

The research questions are further problematic, in that the first is not analytical in nature (how prepared was the EU for the refugee crisis). The answer can only be descriptive and subjective in nature. The second RQ (which policy instruments explain the securitising trend) is also not analytical in nature - it does not as how, but 'which', reducing the answer simply to identifying a list of chosen instruments, assuming the the securitising trend is already present and without contestation (or analysis). The third RQ (to what extent has the handling of the applications for asylum been securitised through discourses in the aftermath of the refugee crisis), is problematic on two accounts. Firstly, asylum applications are not handled at the EU level, they are processed by Member States. Secondly, there seems to be a fundamental issue with the concept of 'discourse', what it is, and how it is analysed in the thesis.

While the thesis does make the effort to engage with certain EU documents, select fragments of speeches of select EU-level leaders, the operationalisation of securitisation theory (both 'threads') fundamentally lacks an analytical approach, which necessitates engagement with 'how' (how are the discourses/practices constructed).

The strong point of the thesis is the outline of the theoretical framework, although this is not met with an in-depth analysis and understanding thereof in the empirical section nor in the conclusion.

What is not clear in the analysis is how the author came to label some 'securitising actors' or practices as 'not, partially or fully' compliant. There is no explanation of these labels, and how the author categorised these aspects and assessed them.

Throughout the thesis, there are many statements that lack explanation, rendering the arguments somewhat weak. For example, in the conclusion the author writes 'securitising processes have influenced European citizenship', without explaining what he means by this.

Possible questions for the defense: What do you understand as 'discourse', and 'discourse analysis', and how would you argue that it has been implemented as a method in your thesis? How may the current refugee situation (ie Ukrainian refugees in the EU) influence the argument of securitising discourses and practices at the EU level? What is the difference between 'securitising practices' and policy instruments in your thesis?

Kraków, dn. 30.11.2022 r.

(miejsce i czas)

(podpis kierującego pracą zatwierdzony elektronicznie)  
dr Karolina Czerska-Shaw