

IEPS MASTER THESIS OPPONENT REVIEW

STUDENT NAME: Annmarie Aiello

THESIS TITLE: Sex for Sale: Globalization and Human Trafficking

OPPONENT NAME: Mgr. Hrishabh Sandilya, MCom.

OPPONENT GRADE: *2 Very Good - Depending on the quality of defense*

The thesis begins in excellent a 'journalistic' manner, which is precisely the problem of this thesis in the later chapters. While the author makes effort to introduce the Topic and Research Hypothesis, it remains poorly defined and one wonders whether the author in the initial parts is trying to define Globalization and its scope rather than a description of the Research problem. The author's claim that primary research was conducted on the technological aspect Globalization visiting websites through which trafficking was conducted is high debatable and this precise lack of primary sources has prevented the author from going as far as she can with Secondary sources and therefore the thesis reads more as a piece of reporting that of scientific analysis.

Structurally the thesis is well laid out and the Chapters are arranged in logical order tracing the history of trafficking and how globalization affects it today. The data gathered is summed up rather than presented and no effort is made to prove any parts of the hypothesis either. The language and vocabulary used too needs to be toned down to ensure that more coherent conclusions are laid out rather than a non-scientific tone. The conclusion is spent describing the activities of an organization, rather than summing up the major findings of the thesis.

The thesis provides an interesting reading of the subject matter yet still fails to scientifically prove the deduced hypothesis 'How Globalization impacts Human Trafficking within a European perspective and instead ends up serving as an introduction to the subject. I would therefore find it hard

to grade this beyond a '2 or Very Good' as the overall lack of primary resources, scattered research objectives and non-scientific manner used, mean that what could have been pivotal research remains an excellent compilation of data from other sources.

My questions to the author would be

1. Given the authors mention of useful field work and primary research conducted at the International Centre for Migration Policy and Development (ICMPD), why was thesis not designed or the hypothesis modified so as to ensure usage of the primary data acquired
2. I would like the author to comment about why in the last chapter she talks about how the Schengen and the convergence of Europe's borders have led to aiding of trafficking, when this goes against common security perspectives that would instead suggest that, with a stronger combined policing and the SIS 1 & 2 (Schengen Information System) Databases as well as stronger borders with countries outside the Schengen, (especially in those that she lists as either source or major transit points) should suggest that it makes trafficking more difficult?

Sincerely

Mgr. Hrishabh Sandilya MCom.