



Report on the part of the final state examination Record of the thesis defence

Academic year: 2022/2023

Student's name and surname: Miriam Hadjeres Montero
Student's ID: 43908944

Type of the study programme: Master's (post-Bachelor)
Study programme: International Master in Security, Intelligence and Strategic Studies (IMSIS)

Study ID: 722489

Title of the thesis: The Coercive Use of Migration on the Southern Border of the European Union: A Case Study of the Melilla Crisis 2022
Thesis department: Department of Security Studies (23-KBS)
Language of the thesis: English
Language of defence: English
Advisor: Sarah Leonard
Date of defence: 21.09.2023 **Venue of defence:** Praha
Attempt: regular

Course of defence: The student's work focused on the issue of coercive use migration at the southern border of the EU. The student began by situating her research topic in a wider real-world and theoretical-empirical scholarly context. Concretely, the student explained she wanted to investigate how migration may be used to gain leverage over the host countries, Spain in her case. She then mentioned how she focused on the historical context of the issue and specifically the 2022 Melilla crisis. The student used a combination of theory-building and hypothesis testing approach to find out that the crisis was a strategic maneuver by Morocco. She then explained her methodology and the data sources, which included a host of secondary sources. Following that, the student described her historical analysis and explained how it allowed her to explain the said crisis, going in more detail over the empirical findings that underpinned her case study and thus conclusions. She underlined how the coercive use of migration was a key aspect of Morocco's ability to exert leverage over an otherwise more powerful neighbor. In conclusion, the student showed how her study contributed to a broader universe of studies focusing on the use of asymmetrical warfare strategies. Moving on to feedback: 1) the argument could be clearer - the student agreed and reiterated her key take-away, that is, that the crisis was just a new symptom of a recurrent pattern; 2) methodology should have been a separate chapter - the student noted that there was probably a misunderstanding on her part of her supervisor's advice. One committee member (supervisor) reflected on some of the feedback, emphasizing how the work often shifted attention and veered into different directions - what was the main focus? Otherwise, however, a very well done work. The student agreed, noted how the work was sometimes confusing. The committee thanked the student and

announced her successful completion of the defense.

Result of defence:	excellent (B)	
Chair of the board:	prof. PhDr. Emil Aslan, Ph.D. (present)
Committee members:	Marcin Kaczmarski, Dr. (present)
	Sarah Leonard (present)