



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Noora Mattson

Title: Immigration Policies - Challenges and Changes that European Union is Facing

Programme/year: MISS (2017)

Author of Evaluation: Dr. Ondrej Ditrych

Criteria	Definition	Max.	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	10	10
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	30	15
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	20
<i>Total</i>		80	45
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	3
	Style	5	2
	Formal requirements	5	5
<i>Total</i>		20	10
TOTAL		100	55



Evaluation

Major criteria:

This is a revised version of a thesis submitted for defence at the end of the last academic year. Unfortunately, despite some adjustments, a number of problems the original manuscript betrayed remains, and therefore the earlier evaluation that *'due to absence of theoretical framework, practically no methodology and often convoluted argument, despite despite providing a decent if somewhat disorganised overview of EU migration policies and the member states, the thesis does not reach conclusions that could be considered a result of a thought process that meets standards of the scientific inquiry'* is retained.

The aim of the thesis is to demonstrate how securitisation of migration has been linked to policy changes in EU and the member states. For that purpose, a new set of RQs is formulated: *whether the securitisation indeed has taken place, what effect it has had on immigratino policies, what (unspecified other) effects it has had beyond the domain of those policies, an finally (and repetitively) what kind of 'impact' it has had on EU and the member states.* The thesis provides substantiated answers to none of those questions, nor does it describe the mechanics of the (rather obvious) securitisation of immigration taking place at various levels in the EU. The theoretical base is insufficient, and the securitisation model as well as positing any causal or constitutive relations to actual policy change is missing. In the course of the later argument, it surfaces that the ontological fundamentals of the securitisation theory with which the author seems to align herself still may not have not been sufficiently internalised - e.g. when terrorism is discussed as a 'reason of securitisation of migration' (p. 17), or it is claimed that 'it can be argued that irregular immigration brings a greater security threat' (p. 32). The presentation of methodology is limited to one paragraph in which the author claims to be using 'qualitative research method', providing no specification or even literature reference to make clear what that should translate into in her research.



The chapter on common immigration policies provides, as in the original manuscript, a decent overview of those policies. However, in the other chapters the argument tends to be limited to paraphrase of a small amount of secondary literature (in some cases poorly chosen, and often extensively relying on a *single*, occasionally even nonacademic source), or it is unclear why these chapters are included at all (security integration).

Minor criteria:

The apparatus of secondary literature is limited, includes nonacademic sources on which the author occasionally relies extensively, and its conclusions are not always relayed and interpreted in a convincing way. Referencing is unsatisfactory in terms of academic standards.

Overall evaluation:

The thesis remains a borderline case for defence. The argument, which is unstructured, not theoretically focused and not following any sound method, does not substantiate the conclusions that some policy changes have been the result of securitisation of migration (p. 61), however as a *hypothesis* this is, needless to say, very plausible. Even when providing a sound descriptive overview of common asylum and migration policies, there is limited analytical or interpretative input on the author's part.

Suggested grade: Good / Fail

Signature: