



IMESS DISSERTATION

Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator

(cc Chiara Amini chiara.amini@ucl.ac.uk and Lisa Cagnacci l.cagnacci@ucl.ac.uk)

Please note that IMESS students are not required to use a particular set of methods (e.g. qualitative, quantitative, or comparative) in their dissertation.

Student:	Lidwina Gundacker
Dissertation title:	Same, but different? A comparison of the integration experiences of refugees and guest worker migrants in Germany

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Poor
Knowledge <i>Knowledge of problems involved, e.g. historical and social context, specialist literature on the topic. Evidence of capacity to gather information through a wide and appropriate range of reading, and to digest and process knowledge.</i>	X		
Analysis & Interpretation <i>Demonstrates a clear grasp of concepts. Application of appropriate methodology and understanding; willingness to apply an independent approach or interpretation recognition of alternative interpretations; Use of precise terminology and avoidance of ambiguity; avoidance of excessive generalisations or gross oversimplifications.</i>	X		
Structure & Argument <i>Demonstrates ability to structure work with clarity, relevance and coherence. Ability to argue a case; clear evidence of analysis and logical thought; recognition of an arguments limitation or alternative views; Ability to use other evidence to support arguments and structure appropriately.</i>	X		
Presentation & Documentation <i>Accurate and consistently presented footnotes and bibliographic references; accuracy of grammar and spelling; correct and clear presentation of charts/graphs/tables or other data. Appropriate and correct referencing throughout. Correct and contextually correct handling of quotations.</i>		X	

ECTS Mark:	A	UCL Mark:	75	Marker:	PhDr. Michal Dimitrov, Ph.D.
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>			–	Signed:	<i>Michal Dimitrov</i>
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>			–	Date:	11. 6. 2018

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+): Note: marks of over 80 are given rarely and only for truly exceptional pieces of work.

Distinctively sophisticated and focused analysis, critical use of sources and insightful interpretation. Comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.

B/C (UCL mark 60-69):

A high level of analysis, critical use of sources and insightful interpretation. Good understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research. 65 or over equates to a B grade.

D/E (UCL mark 50-59):

Demonstration of a critical use of sources and ability to engage in systematic inquiry. An ability to engage in sustained research work, demonstrating methodological awareness. 55 or over equates to a D grade.

F (UCL mark less than 50):

Demonstrates failure to use sources and an inadequate ability to engage in systematic inquiry. Inadequate evidence of ability to engage in sustained research work and poor understanding of appropriate research techniques.

CONTINUES OVERLEAF

Comments, explaining strengths and weaknesses (at least 300 words):

Mrs. Lidwina Gundacker presents the results of her solid, sophisticated and focused analysis and interpretation of integration experiences of foreign guest workers and their families (so-called *Gastarbeiter*) and the integration processes of current refugees in Germany. She argues that understanding integration processes in Federal Republic of Germany since the start of the recruitment of the *Gastarbeiter* in the 1950s and analysing the failures of integration policies may deliver valuable insights to comprehend present-day integration mechanisms of refugees. Mrs. Gundacker comes up with an original research design as she combines a historical approach to identify the main elements that have shaped integration experiences of guest workers in Germany (including the learning process regarding integration policies) with an econometric examination assessing the main factors associated with the economic integration of the current refugee cohort. The author shows ability to understand and describe various limits of her research design and results in many respects (starting with the limits of comparing integration processes of and integration policies on two in many ways different groups and subgroups in different periods and under different political or economic circumstances) and to use collected data from a research study published by BAMF (2016) and another thematic studies for own descriptive and econometric analysis and convincing interpretation of the results on the background of representative secondary literature, identifying correlations rather than causalities. This allows her to offer a well founded normative conclusion about continuity of German integration policy on foreigners/migrants/refugees etc. and a good starting point for a further discussion as she points out, that the “most policy designs are based on the assumption that refugees will return to their home” (...), yet “the overwhelming majority of recently arrived refugees came to stay forever” in contrast to the guest-workers of the first generation (p. 55-56); “although refugee cohorts and guest worker cohorts in parts differ essentially in some characteristics, key challenges to economic integration seem to originate from similar grounds” (p. 59).

There may be found a few weaker points, such as a not very detailed definition of the term “integration”, limited to a short footnote (p. 9); the definitions of “structural-functional level” and “cultural-identificational level” of integration (by Löffler) would deserve a broader explanation (the author does not use these terms in her thesis, she prefers “societal and economic integration”, or “socioeconomic integration”). It would be useful to work with typologies of integration policy as well. This would make the interpretation and conclusion even more persuasive.

The author works with the term “current refugee cohorts”, however, she uses and analyses data collected in 2014, that is before the peak of the latest migration crisis which may put the challenges of integration of refugees into a slightly different perspective. Concerning the fact, that the data is more or less restricted to recognized refugees who had entered the country between 2008 and 2012/3 (with respect to the then average duration of asylum procedure), the word “current” can be challenged as not accurate enough.

Mrs. Gundacker works with footnotes and bibliographic references accurately and consistently, however it took the marker some time to find the source of the key research study by BAMF – “the BAMF refugee survey (2014)” (see p. 33ff.); it is listed in bibliography as “Worbs, S., E. Bund and A. Böhm. 2016. “Asyl - und dann?” Forschungsbericht 28. Nürnberg: Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (BAMF).” Concerning the source of the data, it may be surprising, why the author did not use another, broader qualitative study published by IAB in 2016 as well (Brücker, Herbert et al. 2016. “Geflüchtete Menschen in Deutschland – eine qualitative Befragung. IAB-Forschungsbericht 9/2016“, Nürnberg: Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung), at least to confront or confirm the data sets and results of the survey published by BAMF. Meanwhile, a new study based on a similar and bigger survey conducted in 2016 by IAB/BAMF/SOEP was published in December 2017 and updated/revised in April 2018 (Brücker, Herbert/Rother, Nina/Schupp, Jürgen, eds. 2017: IAB-BAMF-SOEP-Befragung von Geflüchteten 2016: Studiendesign, Feldergebnisse sowie Analysen zu schulischer wie beruflicher Qualifikation, Sprachkenntnissen sowie kognitiven Potenzialen. Forschungsbericht 30, Nürnberg: Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge) – it is understandable, that Mrs. Gundacker was not able to analyse the newest data, but she possibly could have mentioned at least the key findings of the latest study in her conclusion, as the new study claims to offer the very first reliable information on people arriving between 2013 and 2016, and confront them with the findings of the survey conducted by Worbs et al. and her own analysis.

Despite the remarks above, Mrs. Lidwina Gundacker deserves the ECTS Mark A. Her master thesis shows her ability to engage in sustained independent research.

Specific questions you would like addressing at the oral defence (at least 2 questions):

- 1) Why did the author not use or at least refer to a similar, qualitative survey by IAB, published in 2016 (Brücker et al., see above), the same year as the survey by BAMF/Worbs et al.?
- 2) Why does the author refer to the definition/typology of integration by Löffler (“structural-functional level” and “cultural-identificational level”), but works rather with the terms “societal and economic integration”, or “socioeconomic integration”? How would she explain differences and correlations within these terms/definitions?
- 3) The analysis is based on data collected by 2014 for refugees who had arrived Germany a couple of years before the peak of the latest migration crisis (2015). Does the survey by Brücker et al., published by IAB/BAMF/SOEP in 2017/2018 (see above) indicate any changes or do they support the conclusions by the author based on the survey by BAMF/Worbs et al. and her own analysis? How has the context of integration of refugees (including integration policies in Germany) changed since then?