

**UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE**  
**Fakulta sociálních věd**  
**Institut mezinárodních studií**

**PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE**  
**(Posudek oponenta)**

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Alena Jiskrová**

Název práce: *Proměna migračních politik Francie za prezidentského mandátu Françoise Hollanda*

---

Oponoval (u externích oponentů uveďte též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce): Paul Bauer PhD. IMS

1. OBSAH A CÍL PRÁCE (stručná informace o práci, formulace cíle):

The work deals with the evolution of French migration policy under Hollande Presidency. The candidate proposes to study the changes of this policy during the refugee crisis in 2015. She observes the state of the policy before, during and after the massive movement of refugees that followed the wars in Syria and in Irak.

2. VĚCNÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (náročnost, tvůrčí přístup, argumentace, logická struktura, teoretické a metodologické ukotvení, práce s prameny a literaturou, vhodnost příloh apod.):

The research question is formulated in page 7 as following: What are the external factors that influence French migration policy during the refugee crisis? The question is not sophisticated but interesting. Unfortunately, the content of the essay does not match with the question. Little is said about the “external circumstances” linked to the refugee crisis.

The author then formulates a hypothesis that is not really clear to grasp, as she states that France attracts migrants because it belongs to developed western countries with an important migrant community (?). I am not sure this could be considered as a hypothesis.

Further, the hypothesis doesn't really match with the research question which aims at looking at external factors for the understanding of migration policy in France.

Moreover, the theoretical choice doesn't fully help to pursue the research objective. Apart from the *push-pull factors* theory, it isn't clear why the work needs to deal with integration policies for the understanding of the external factors that influence French migration policy.

The logic and the structure of the first part is pretty weak, not saying un-logical. I do not understand why the state of the art arrived after the theoretical anchorage of the work and the methodological choice. Additionally, I do not understand why the research question appears in the methodological section.

The history section is brief and retraces quite properly the main stage of French migration history - not without avoiding some small misreading of French history, for instance, when the author mentions Napoleonic wars to explain France's demographic deficit in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In reality, it is rather the establishing of the Civil Code that states the equal inheritance among descents that contributes to the birth rates decrease in 19th century France.

The development is brief. Some information are confusing in the text and show an awkward contextualization of the subject: p.20 the author present the creation of the French Council of the Muslim Cult (CFCM) as a direct consequence of the Charlie Hebdo attack in 2015. In reality, the CFCM has been created years before, under Sarkozy's presidency.

Several time the author present a link between terrorism and migration (this idea belongs to extreme right rhetoric) to explain the shift in French migration policy, lacking to explain that the great majority of the perpetrators of terrorist attacks are not migrants. The absence of a critical view in this regard is surprising for such a subject.

3. FORMÁLNÍ A JAZYKOVÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (jazykový projev, správnost citace a odkazů na literaturu, grafická úprava, formální náležitosti práce apod.):

As I am not a Czech native speaker, I won't comment on the written style, but saying that the text, despite it's structural weakness is clear to read. The references are rather well quoted with some small mistakes, that do not affect the reading. The literature is extensive enough for a bachelor thesis. The candidate makes the use of an important amount of primary documentation, composed of laws, official publications and newspaper articles.

4. STRUČNÝ KOMENTÁŘ HODNOTITELE (celkový dojem z bakalářské práce, silné a slabé stránky, originalita myšlenek, naplnění cíle apod.):

For the several reasons indicated above - misleading contextualization, formal information mistakes, awkward structure, disconnection between the research question, the theoretical anchorage, the hypothesis and the content, the work is not convincing.

5. OTÁZKY A PŘIPOMÍNKY DOPORUČENÉ K BLIŽŠÍMU VYSVĚTLENÍ PŘI OBHAJOBĚ (jedna až tři):

Could you please stress briefly what are the external circumstances of the refugee crisis, and how they influence the French migration policy.

Could you briefly relate the changes in French migration policy with the ones observable in other European countries? What are the commonalities and the differences? Do we observe the making of a European migration policy regards to migration movements and integration?

6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA

(A-F): D-E according to the quality of the defense

Datum: 8th June 2020

Podpis: P.Bauer

---

Pozn.: Hodnocení píše k jednotlivým bodům, pokud nepíšete v textovém editoru, použijte při nedostatku místa zadní stranu nebo příložený list. V hodnocení práce se pokuste oddělit ty její nedostatky, které jsou, podle vašeho mínění, obhajobou neodstranitelné (např. chybí kritické zhodnocení pramenů a literatury), od těch věcí, které student může dobrou obhajobou napravit; poměr těchto dvou položek berte prosím v úvahu při stanovení konečné známky.