

IMESS dissertation						
Name:	Claudia Chlebek					
Dissertation title:	A Holistic Analysis of Polish Return Migration Programs					
Scale: 5 - excellent, 4 - good, 3 - satisfactory, 2 - poor, 1 – very poor						
	5	4	3	2	1	
ARGUMENT:						
Clearly defined research question		4				No clearly defined research question
Answers research question		4				Does not answer research question
Well structured			3			Badly structured
Shows theoretical awareness	5					Shows no theoretical awareness
Conceptual clarity			3			Conceptual confusion
Empirically appropriate & robust		4				Full of empirical errors
Logical and coherent		4				Illogical and incoherent
Analytical		4				Descriptive
Critical		4				Uncritical
Shows independent thought	5					Does not show independent thought
SOURCES & USAGE:						
Evidence of reading/research			3			No evidence of reading/research
Effective use of sources/data			3			Ineffective use of sources/data
WRITING STYLE:						
Clear		4				Obscure
Good punctuation	5					Poor punctuation
Grammatically correct	5					Grammatically incorrect
PRESENTATION:						
Appropriate length		4				Too long/short
Good referencing			3			Poor/inconsistent referencing
Good spelling	5					Poor spelling
Good bibliography			3			Poor bibliography

Comments:

Claudia has written a dissertation which might serve as an example of IMESS dissertation - it covers the field of all three tracks (economy, politics and society) and within the context of qualitative methodology analyzes economic topic including extensions to other important areas. This combination seems to be useful especially in the case of topic like that where it is very hard to find reliable data and carry out purely quantitative approaches.

First part of the text is introducing us to the topic and explaining all possible risks (including the insufficiency of its quantitative background), second part performs combination of theoretical framework with economic dimension of the topic and third part focuses on analysis and explanation of the role of the three migration programmes in Poland devoted to return migration. Here she created her own "evaluation rubric" assessing the core and efficiency of the three mentioned programmes and defines also possible recommendations for their improvement.

I would appreciate more analysis of quantitative troubles (in concrete situations), since this might serve as good way of orientation for another scholar).

My second remark would lead to the question, whether we can identify some theory behind the three return migration programmes in Poland – do they use theoretical ramification (explicitly) or it's just a piece of pragmatic administration)?

Critical remarks:

1. Complete lack of the chapter analysing primary sources and secondary literature, this is an obvious part of every academic publication and it could prevent the author from mistaken referencing in some cases

2. Lack of the chapter focusing on theory and methodology of the work – a reviewer is becoming acquainted with most of the stuff just when reading the text and it is not always clear which is the identity and nature of author's own conceptualization

2. Disproportions in the structure: different extent, two chapters 5.1. (pp. 49-50), in some cases

Specific Questions for oral defence:

1. How would you assess Polish migrations today in the general context of Polish migrations in the modern history?

Deducted for late submission:	Deducted for faulty referencing:	Mark*:
Charles marker:	Signed:	Date:

***Mark: A = 70+; B = 65-69; C = 60-64; D = 55-59; E = 50-54; F = fail, less than 50, see Scheme of award –please, fill in this way: Charles/IMESS (e.g. Výborně/A)**

Scheme of award (assessment criteria):

	Charles University**	IMESS
Excellent	Výborně [1]	A
Very Good	Velmi dobře [2]	B
Good	Velmi dobře [2.5]	C
Satisfactory	Dobře [3]	D
Sufficient	Dobře [3.5]	E
Fail	Neprospěl [4]	F