European Politics and Society — Joint Dissertation Review

Name of the student:	Patxi Abarzuza Garciandia
Title of the thesis:	Identifying Securitising Dynamics in Discourse and Practice: The Handling of Asylum applications in the Context of the 2015 "Refugee Crisis"
Reviewer:	Zenia Hellgren

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD
(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

Very comprehensive and overall excellent literature review. A mature analysis of the literature used, showing that the student knows the field well and is able to use different theories with great autonomy in relation to his own conceptual framework, research question and objective.

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

The methodology and data selection is relevant for the purpose of the study and consistent with the theoretical framework outlined in the literature section.

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

The conclusions are coherent with the research questions and the date use. The author satisfactorily achieves the research objectives.

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE
(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

Excellent language, very well written thesis overall. The author's own voice is clearly present though always well-founded in the literature he uses. Compliance with academic standards throughout.

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT
(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

This is a very strong thesis altogether, in terms of problem formulation; theorizing and analysis. I consider it worthy of the mark "Excellent".

Grade (A-F):	
Date:	Signature:
A	

classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
A (91-100)	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'.