

CHARLES UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE
Faculty of Social Sciences
Institute of International Studies

PROTOCOL ON DIPLOMA THESIS ASSESSMENT
(Supervisor)

Name of the student: Shpresonë Grulaj

Title: The work of Government and non-Government organizations in refugee integration in the German labor market, Sep. 2015-Jan. 2016.

Supervisor: Ondřej Klípa

1. TOPIC AND OBJECTIVE (short information on the thesis, research objective):

Shpresonë's thesis analyses challenges faced by refugees entering Germany as well as what has been done by government and nongovernment actors in order to help refugees integrate into the German labor market. She focused on a short period between September 2015 and January 2016. In the studied period, she depicted both the government measures taken to ease refugees to entry the labor market and integration programs run by German NGOs.

2. CONTENT (complexity, original approach, argument, structure, theoretical and methodological backing, work with sources, appropriateness of annexes etc.):

Shpresonë chose very important and politically relevant topic. Since Germany received an unparalleled number of refugees from the recent so-called migration crisis, it deserves proper academic attention. Especially the integration of the refugees into the German labor market became (together with culture differences and Islamic extremism) a source of concern and anxiety among many Germans and other Europeans. It is thus welcome to study obstacles in this integration and the tools which could remove them. Although the topic has already been embraced by various academic projects, Shpresonë innovatively tried to compare the activities of government and non-government organizations in a detailed perspective.

She worked with a wide array of sources on refugee integration in general, and in Germany in particular. The methods of her research are described sufficiently so that one can easily trace the research process.

3. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE (quality of language, citation style, graphics, formal aspects etc.):

The quality of language is adequate, except for some minor issues (such as overly repeated words). The (adjusted) Chicago citation style is acceptable, although not typical for the Czech academic environment. Shpresonë sometimes made small mistakes (punctuation) in it. The whole text also feels like some more structuring would be needed. For instance, the long "literature review" could have been graphically (with subheadings?) divided into smaller parts. But other parts should have been broken down into shorter paragraphs too so that it helps its readability.

The list of references would also look better if it was divided into "literature" and "primary (other) sources", such as organizations' reports, government materials, etc.

4. STATEMENT ON THE ORIGINALITY OF THE THESIS

The thesis was checked by the Turnitin/URKUND/Theses anti-plagiarism software and it is an original text (the similarities reach only 3%).

5. SHORT COMMENTS BY THE REVIEWER (overall impression, strengths and weaknesses, originality of ideas, achievement of the research objective etc.):

I find the thesis well written, analytically persuasive, with a relevant topic, but too descriptive. Although Shpresonë tried to include a theoretical approach, her attempt is not very convincing. “Grounded theory” is an elaborated concept with its own methodology which should be followed throughout the whole thesis. Otherwise, it serves just as a textual “ornament” for no use. Instead of creating a new theory in an inductive way, Shpresonë could have chosen and highlight anything from the literature that needs to be clarified or corrected and follow that direction. If there wasn’t anything “problematic” in the reviewed literature, at least some hypothesis should have been more explicitly formulated and tested. Without “problematizing” of the studied case (in one way or another), the thesis brings only limited outcome that could be generalized and that could further enhance the academic debate on the issue (except for rather banal findings like the role of language barrier that have already been well described in the literature).

6. COOPERATION WITH THE SUPERVISOR (communication with the supervisor, ability to reflect comments, shift from the original intention, etc.)

I have no objections. Shpresonë reflected my comments and adjusted her original research plans radically, although some more work on the research design should have been done.

7. QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED DURING THE DEFENCE:

1/ Did you have any preconceptions about the role of (non-)government bodies’ role in refugee integration in Germany prior to your research? Were they approved by your research or disproved?

2/ Could you comment on the overall impact of refugees that entered Germany within the recent refugee influx on the Germany labor market?

3/ How did the COVID pandemic change the activities of (non-)government organisations vis-à-vis refugees’ integration?

8. (NON-)RECOMMENDATION AND SUGGESTED GRADE:

YES – B or C (on A-F scale)

Date:

Signature: