

Name of the student:	Ana Ichqitidze
Title of the thesis:	
Reviewer:	Joost Augusteijn

**1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD**

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

The research question is clear and situated in a broader discussion of the impact of the Lisbon Treaty, and an absence of works on the connection between parliamentary scrutiny and active involvement in the IPC. The amount of literature used seems rather limited, just 13 works including a number of articles and short works are included in the list of literature which does not seem complete, but would be a too narrow bases to work with. Overall the literature review is reasonably comprehensive at least very relevant to the topic.

**2. ANALYSIS**

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

There is a good discussion of methodology which describes what has been done and the basis in the literature for the approach taken, but the justification for the various aspects such as the use of Putnam theory, the way the workings of each parliamentary system are measured, why different parliamentary scrutiny systems would lead to different participation in IPC, and what the hypotheses based on is not very clear. What the limitations are of the methodology chosen, is not touched upon although a singular mention is made of it.

**3. CONCLUSIONS**

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

The main problem with the thesis is that It is unclear what the conclusions are based upon. There is no listing of how the various parliamentary systems in the different countries worked, how active they were or any clear exploration of research results. The only thing we get is a short description of each countries features without any backing in fact. All this leads to a disappointing conclusion.

**4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE**

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

The grammar and style of writing is rather deficient, impeding the understanding of what is meant. There is also a tendency to assume the reader has a lot of background knowledge, f.i. through the use of abbreviations without explanation, but more importantly it is not explained what the exact role is of national parliaments in the formulation of foreign policy of the EU. A table of content is missing. Literature list is not complete nor alphabetically ordered. In lay out paragraphs are hard to distinguish.

## 5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

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

--

Grade (A-F): C/D	
Date:	Signature:

In itself there is a good understanding shown of the existing literature and the methodology is well described, if not clearly justified. The presentation is however very deficient and particularly unclear is what the actual research has actually done or is based on.

Questions for viva: What about non-visual behind the scene work by parliamentary delegations in IPC? Are there cultural aspects that play a role in this?

How about the subjectivity in the indicators you use to determine the features of the political system and the levels of activity?

classification scheme

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'.