



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Iuliia Poderiagina

Title: Environmental migrants in the age of global warming

Programme/year: NP_MAIN, 2024

Author of Evaluation (supervisor/second reader): Eliška Pohnerová

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	10	8
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	30	20
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	30
<i>Total</i>		80	58
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	10
	Style	5	5
	Formal requirements	5	3
<i>Total</i>		20	18
TOTAL		100	76



Evaluation

Major criteria: First of all, thank you for the opportunity to read the thesis in question. Stylistically, it is easy to read and has a natural flow.

However, it has major issues in the structure, such as a missing methodological section (only one paragraph is included in the introduction), with the conceptualisation of the difference between “environmental/climate migrants/refugees” coming only in the middle of the empirical part (p. 24).

Further missing is the state-of-the-art (and potentially theoretical section) that would show the reader where the research stands at the moment and in what direction it is being expanded. Consequently, I have the impression that the thesis is heavily descriptive and only reiterates existing writings in the field (a quick Google Scholar search brought me to very similar texts, for example, Berchin et al., 2017 - <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.06.022> - Has the topic been covered for a number of years now? What has changed in the topic in the meantime?).

Of course, there is nothing wrong with a descriptive thesis, but I believe there was a potential space for a larger contribution (for example, there is or at least was a proposed environmental relocation of Nauru to Australia after Australian companies mined out the phosphate resources – Does it fall within the topic of climate/environmental refugees?).

Minor criteria: The missing sections mentioned above for the content should be reiterated here in terms of structure. It should also be noted that the standardised abstract is usually one paragraph only and concise in content – different from what the author compiled. Attention should be paid to vague or overstating phrases such as “Some people argue” (p. 27) or “Many scholars (p. 30 – How many people? Who exactly?).

Assessment of plagiarism: Although the overall similarity in the SIS is 23%, this is assumably due to the large number of definitions included in the analysis. These are well-referenced.

Overall evaluation: The thesis visibly shows a lot of the author’s effort and time spent; it is well-written and heavily informed. However, there is room for improvement, especially when it comes to an original contribution, working with existing research (like state of the art and not just empirical), and possibly a broader discussion on the Anthropocene, climate change and accountability.

Suggested grade: To Ms. Poderiagina, I suggest a grade of C (good).

 Obnovitelný podpis

X 

Eliška Pohnerová
opponent

Signature: Podepsal(a): 54e52203-2300-4209-a5c4-4580e47e2e1e