



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Ulises Noé Cárdenas Zúñiga

Title: Securitization through Practice: Frontex's Capacities and Operations during the 2015 Asylum and Migration Crisis

Programme/year: International Security Studies, 2024

Author of Evaluation (second reader): Tomáš Karásek

| Criteria | Definition | Maximum | Points |
|-----------------------|---|------------|-----------|
| Major Criteria | | | |
| | Research question, definition of objectives | 10 | 8 |
| | Theoretical / conceptual framework | 30 | 28 |
| | Methodology, analysis, argument | 40 | 35 |
| <i>Total</i> | | 80 | 71 |
| Minor Criteria | | | |
| | Sources | 10 | 10 |
| | Style | 5 | 4 |
| | Formal requirements | 5 | 5 |
| <i>Total</i> | | 20 | 19 |
| TOTAL | | 100 | 90 |



Evaluation

Major criteria:

The thesis features all the elements which are expected of and appreciated in this form of an academic text: a clear research objective, a strong theoretical anchor, explicitly pronounced methodology and complex analysis. In its dissection of the evolution of Frontex, the author has abundantly demonstrated his ability to combine the conceptual and the empirical; more than that, his understanding of the array of theories that inform his ontological and epistemological stances is truly profound.

And yet, the ensuing analysis, while rich in information and complex in its presentation of the subject matter, feels surprisingly flat when compared to the initially stated ambition that derives its flamboyance from the Foucauldian and related intellectual sources. This reviewer was struck by the notion mentioning “analysing the historical development of the EU’s integration process” (p. 24) that followed after a standard-issue, textbook-like description of well-known facts; it symbolically illustrates the tension between the initial ambition and the level of its realization.

A possible reason could be the author’s decision to, proverbially, put the cart before the horse by constructing the dissertation’s methodology before outlining its theoretical framework. For, in spite of the claim made in the first sentence of chapter 2, chapter 1 does not only “outline ontological and epistemological positions” (p. 12), it also, true to its title, formulates the thesis’s methodology. But this should follow from the selected theory, not precede it. The author is well aware that process-tracing is a demanding discipline. Yet he chooses the methodology ahead of opting for the theoretical basis of the Paris School, without asking whether (or to what extent) the causal mechanisms, inherent in the process-tracing method, and the ontology of a social field are mutually compatible. In the end, we do not learn whether it is the case, as both process-tracing as a method and social field as an ontological *locus* rather frame than truly inform and drive the empirical analysis.

Minor criteria:

The thesis is nicely written, mostly in high-quality academic language (though the writing of concepts such as “Causal Mechanism”, “Theorized Causal Mechanism”, “Process-Tracing” with initial capital letters is a bit annoying), and is clearly structured. The author must be commended for an exemplary utilization of the dissertation’s sources.



**FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
Charles University

Assessment of plagiarism:

The thesis does not exhibit traits of plagiarism.

Overall evaluation:

If judged separately, both the theoretical-methodological and the empirical-analytical parts are outstanding, the former in demonstrating the author's deep understanding of complex concepts and the latter in conveying his analytical acumen. However, the theoretical and methodological expectations do not fully materialize in the ensuing analysis.

Suggested grade: **B**

Signature: