

Name of the student:	Marius Heil
Title of the thesis:	European and German Political Foundations: Roles and Influences in the EU Enlargement Process
Reviewer:	Dr Natasza Styczyńska, Jagiellonian University

### 1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD

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

The thesis tackles important and interesting topic of the engagement of political foundations in the process of EU enlargement. Marius has chosen not an easy task as there is not much of the existing literature focusing on the political foundations.  
State of the art is solid, but the wider context is missing – I would be interested in reading more about the relevance of the political foundations in the EU policy making.  
The RQ are well formulated and the dataset chosen to answer them carefully prepared. It might be more relevant however to chose a bigger sample or justify better why just this 2 actors are taken into consideration.

### 2. ANALYSIS

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

Theoretical considerations are rather superficial and not discussed in detail (which, obviously, is later visible when it comes to the findings). Three methods (process-tracing, method of 'attributed influence', and thematic analysis) are mentioned and discussed but in the very descriptive manner.  
The questionable is if one can measure impact/influence based on documents and 5 interviews only.

### 3. CONCLUSIONS

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

Easy to read conclusions remain (as most of the work) quite descriptive. The Author discusses if the actors in question act as norm entrepreneurs, knowledge brokers and watchdogs but the final part of the thesis could be more critical and propose more advanced interpretations.

### 4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE

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

Thesis are well written and according to academic standards, work is easy to follow, with appropriate citations.

### 5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

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

The strong sides: original empirical material, focus on under researched topic, easy to read and follow language  
The weak points: descriptive, weak theoretical grounding

<b>Grade (A-F):</b>	4 (C)
Date:	Signature:

9.09.2023

classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
	Score Range	Percentage	Score	Percentage	Score Range	Percentage	Score Range	Percentage
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'.