MASTER´S EXAMINER REPORT

GPS – Geopolitical Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Thesis title:	Immigration waves and the policy-response of the U.S.: A Study of Mexican Immigrants in the U.S.
Name of Student:	**Bingyu Jin**
Referee *(incl. titles)*:	**Bohumil Doboš, Ph.D.**
Report Due Date:	**18.6.2021**

Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the four numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).

1) Contribution and argument:
The thesis presents a historical analysis of US policies towards the immigration from Mexico based in secondary sources´ analysis. As such, it provides an interesting overview of the policies but lacks any original contribution. There is no basic argument being made or primary-source analysis provided. All the ideas seem to be derived from already existing academic sources. All the chapters are including analyses taken from existing sources with very limited input by the author herself. While the summary of the policy approaches might be interesting for those studying the issue, such a contribution is insufficient for a Master´s Thesis.

2) Theoretical and methodological framework:
There is no theoretical background. The thesis is based in a historical descriptive method based in secondary sources´ analysis. The thesis calls this "literature research method" and "case analysis method" which is unusual. The thesis asks seven (!) research questions but does not answer a single one of them in the conclusion. There is no analytical chapter that would tie the text to the RQs. The historical part overview is only weakly connected to the chapter on Obama policy.

3) Sources and literature:
Introduction is unsourced – the first source at page 8. Bibliography is not correctly (alphabetically) arranged. Many lengthy parts are left without a citation despite the fact, that they are mainly historical overviews. Primary documents the paper analyzes are not cited and all the contents are taken from secondary literature.

4) Manuscript form and structure:
Headings in the introduction need to be numbered as currently the structure is confusing. On p. 49, the figure is uncited and not numbered/named – if there is a mention of it in the appendix, the chart should be put there as well. Otherwise, the structure is quite logical if missing a very important theoretical and analytical chapters.

5) Quality of presentation
The quality of language is sufficiently good. The paper sometimes shows some irregular formulations like "flood of Mexican immigrants" and has several parts that might be more comprehensive, but in general there are no major issues.

CATEGORY		**POINTS**
Contribution (research quality, analysis, and conclusions)	*(max. 40 points)*	15
Theoretical and methodological framework	*(max. 25 points)*	15
Sources and literature	*(max. 10 points)*	6
Manuscript form and structure	*(max. 15 points)*	13
Quality of presentation (grammar, style, coherence)	*(max. 10 points)*	9
TOTAL POINTS	*(max. 100 points)*	**58**
The proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F)		**E**

Suggested questions for the defence are:
How would you evaluate the changes in the US immigration policy aster the beginning of Biden administration?

I recommend the thesis for final defence.

Mgr. Bohumil Doboš, Ph.D.

Digitálně podepsal Mgr. Bohumil Doboš, Ph.D.
Datum: 2021.05.08 17:52:34 +02'00'

Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	**GRADE**	Quality standard
91 – 100	**A**	= outstanding (high honor)
81 – 90	**B**	= superior (honor)
71 – 80	**C**	= good
61 – 70	**D**	= satisfactory
51 – 60	**E**	= low pass at a margin of failure
0 – 50	**F**	= failing. The thesis is not recommended for defence.