



Name and title of evaluator: **Sebastian Ziaja**

Please tick box: I am ☐ first supervisor ☒ second supervisor of the thesis.

Student number: 16837595

Name of student: Niclas Schlecht

Title of the thesis: **Effects of the Brexit referendum on the Common Security and Defence Policy**

Assessment dimensions (listed items are optional criteria)		Assessment				
		Fail	Pass	Satisfactory	Good	Very good
1	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Topic: Definition and context Research question 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comments: The question is rather idiosyncratic but still relevant given the high salience of Brexit and CSDP.						
2	Literature review/theoretical framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of the relevant literature Gap in the literature Theoretical argument Research hypotheses 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Comprehensive and generally useful.						
3	Research design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case selection, data collection and method of analysis Suitability of research design and methodological approach 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Moravcsik's Liberal IR theory is well suited to analyze the research question, and well described. The two methods employed are described in detail, but the method of synthesizing the gathered empirical evidence remains unclear.						
4	Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data quality Execution of analysis Presentation of results 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: The description of CSDP processes after the Brexit vote is comprehensive and well executed. Pieces of evidence are classified as supporting either of the two hypotheses, but their weight could be more explicitly discussed.						
5	Summary and Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answer to the question Broader implications of the findings Critical discussion of own research 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: The main finding is convincingly laid out. But the weighting of the different pieces of evidence seems somewhat improvised and could have been made more explicit. I also find it hard to understand the authors arguments on the limitations of Liberal IR theory. There are certainly limitations, but I do not agree that "Liberal IR theory focusses on one level of analysis only (domestic)" (page 89): Realist and Institutional factors are explicitly permitted to interact with aggregated preferences; the author argues accordingly in some parts of the analysis. More importantly, broader theoretical implications of the empirical results are not discussed.						
6	Write-up and presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structure Language and flow of the text Acknowledgement of sources and quotations Design and careful layout Spelling and punctuation 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Both the use of idioms and grammatical errors are distributed unevenly across the document: The literature review, for example, is much stronger in terms of language than the abstract and the theory and analysis sections. I wonder whether a substantive structure rather than the employed chronological order would have made the argument clearer.						

Summary and final assessment:

A research question with high idiosyncratic value is answered comprehensively with suitable methods. There is room for improvement in synthesizing evidence more systematically and a lack of discussing broader implications.

Grade: **2.0**

Date of signature: **16 January 2019**

Name of examiner: **Sebastian Ziaja**

..... (Signature examiner)