



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Salomé Bertrand

Title: The European Immigration Policies During the Refugee Crisis and the Impact on “Transit” Countries: A Comparative Analysis between Turkey and Morocco

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	6
	Theoretical / conceptual framework	30	23
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	29
<i>Total</i>		80	58
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	8
	Style	5	4
	Formal requirements	5	4
<i>Total</i>		20	16
TOTAL		100	74



Evaluation

Major criteria:

This is an intriguing thesis. On the one hand, it features an ambitious – and well articulated – research objective. The author has gone a long way to fulfil its promise. The thesis features a substantial literature review, a robust theoretical chapter and explicitly explained methodology. Most importantly, the author has, beyond what is usually expected, much less required in a master’s dissertation, conducted a number of *in situ* interviews that are not just a supplementary element but actually constitute the core of the research. The attachment that contains them demonstrates the breadth and depth of the author’s effort.

Unfortunately, the aforementioned elements, laudable as they are, do not eventually add up. Starting with the literature review, while it is both substantial and well structured, it lacks a clear focus and direction. The purpose of the literature review is not only to show what has been written about the topic, but to clearly establish its nature, boundaries and, most importantly, identify the research niche which the analysis would later explore in a way not present here.

Secondly, the author claims (p. 16) that the third research sub-question (“How did the new immigration policies in both countries impact the socio-economic integration of migrants in both countries?”) constitutes the core of her research. But this question only confirms what the second sub-question suggests: that the main aim of the research actually heads out of the boundaries of security studies as a discipline, no matter how broadly defined. In short, treating immigration policies as an independent variable and socio-economic integration as a dependent one seems more suitable for sociological or economic research.

Thirdly, while the author needs to be commended for the ambitious research aim, the combination of the three research sub-questions pushed the ambition a bit too far. Explaining the impact on European policies on immigration policies in Morocco and Turkey, analyzing these policies’ outcomes *and* explaining their impact on the immigrants is simply too complex a task to be accomplished not just within the scope of a single thesis, but, more importantly, in a way that can effectively utilize a unified research design.

That leads me to the next point, which is a disjunction between theory and methodology/analysis. The theoretical part leans strongly into the concepts of securitization and human security, but the methodological section fails to effectively operationalize them. The latter concept has, at least, an implicit connection with the actual focus of the empirical chapters. But the former, securitization, would require



FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES Charles University

either a clearly defined textual dataset (if treated in the understanding of the Copenhagen School), or a well-understood (segment of a) social field (if applied in securitization's praxeological reformulation). None is present here, and the conducted interviews are ill-equipped to compensate for this deficit.

Fourthly, the author claims to have opted for a qualitative study "because of the nature of the research question" (p. 28). However, the socio-economic factors on which the thesis focuses could easily have accommodated a quantitative element in the form of statistical data concerning the immigrants' socio-economic position. This is not to say the author's should have necessarily opted for these, just to point out a problem in the justification of the approach that was applied in the thesis.

Finally, when it comes to the selection of the respondents of the interviews, the author explains why she chose them, but this explanation still lacks the quality of a systematic tackling of this task. Given how strongly the thesis relies on the interviews, a triangulation strategy would have been useful to compensate for their potential bias and subjective perspective.

Minor criteria and assessment of plagiarism:

The thesis is nicely written and generally well structured. That being said, the structuring could have been better within the chapters, as overlong paragraphs (often surpassing two pages) hinder the reader's orientation in the text. It is also questionable to position discussion (chapter 7) before conclusion (chapter 6).

The thesis does not exhibit traits of plagiarism. However, there are limits to how the author uses its sources – for example, in the chapters that constitute the core of empirical analysis (5.1 and 5.2), there are barely any references to other sources that the interviewees mentioned in the text. The interviews, while provided in full in the attachment, are not dated and some of its participants are not identified. It is fully understandable that the author wished to anonymize some of the interviewees, but that is not the same as not providing any specific background information (concerning their sex, age etc.).

Overall evaluation:

This is a strong thesis at the level of research objectives and the effort invested in conducting the research interviews. On the other hand, it fails to connect its constitutive elements into a persuasive overall structure in which its theoretical, methodological and analytical elements would clearly correspond.



**FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
Charles University

Suggested grade: C

Signature: