

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

Comments:

As the marking above makes it obvious, the strengths of the dissertation are the very good insight in return migration theories and their application, strong analytical skills and thorough knowledge of existing literature.

On the other hand the most problematic aspect concerns the structure of the dissertation in its entirety and some missing sections especially. In spite of the elaborate theory review (section 6), the text comprises neither a literature review nor a special section dedicated to the explanation of chosen methods, both supposed to follow the introduction. Furthermore some sections extensively vary in number of pages they include (e. g. section 1.2 of one paragraph versus section 4.1 of 13 pages). Finally an additional proofreading before the dissertation submission would have disclosed several textual imperfections such as: repeating the identical text in sections 5.1 and 5.2, having two successive sections with the same number (10.4), omitting the second one in the table of content, or matching a heading with a wrong figure (p. 72).

The final comment concerns referencing. Although many cited sources are works by two or more authors, some of them were referred as single author articles or books (e.g. Constant, 2002; Grabowska-Lusińska, 2009; Kahanec, 2010). Moreover, pages numbers were not always added for direct quotes (e.g. p. 4 – Kahanec, 2010) or statistics (e.g. p. 7 – Iglicka, 2010).

Specific Questions for oral defence:

1) As the section 5 of the dissertation (concerning return migration strategies) is not complete, would you present the omitted strategy of intentionally-unforeseeable return?

2) Which migration theory would you apply to explain a significant increase in the number of Polish migrants registered in Britain in 2010?

3) Would you describe the Tax Abolition Act passed by the Polish government in 2008, as an effective “pull” factor stimulating return migration?

|                                |                                  |                                       |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Deducted for late submission:  | Deducted for faulty referencing: | <b>Mark*:</b><br><b>velmi dobře/B</b> |
| Charles marker: Lucie Filipová | Signed:                          | Date: 15 <sup>th</sup> June<br>2011   |

**\*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):**

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