

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): Anna Simbartlová

Název práce: **Občanská integrace přistěhovalců ve Francii v letech 2002-2012**

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

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

In her work, the candidate discusses the characteristics of the concept of „civic integration“ and its function as a new political model for the integration of migrants in France between 2002 and 2012.

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

To do so, the author draws principally from the approach proposed by the american politist Roger Brubaker in his article „The return of assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its seques in France, Germany, and the United States“, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24, No. 4, July 2001.

Following the hypothesis of a substantial return of assimilationist policies in France en Europe, Anna Simbartlová, tries to describe the recent policies of civic integration in France and compares it with older assimilationist and multiculturalist approaches to social integration.

The analysis build principally on official statements and legislativ acts.

Concerning the structure, the thesis opens with a theoretical chapter, outlining the several approaches to migration policies and recalling very briefly the differences between assimilationist and multicultural models. In a second step, the author presents a historical overview of migration and integration policies in France. The third part presents the research results properly speaking where the author proceed to the evaluation of civic integration in this country.

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

The thesis is written in Czech. As I am not a Czech native speaker, I wont comment on the stylistic characteristic of the work.

The primary and secondary documentation are not very extensive but quoted properly. The general formal aspect of the work is good.

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

If the general impression of the diploma is good, the work calls for some critics that touch the structure of the text and the content of the results.

To the structure, my remarks concern the progression of the development in the detail (not visible from the table of contents) whose logic is not always easy to follow and doesnt avoid redundancies, notably in the part „1.2. Teoretický základ“- where the articulation between migration and integration is not underlined – and even more in the second part of the thesis.

Here, the historical presentation of the migration policies is separated from the history of the integration policies. This is particularely surprising since the integration policy was and is a part of the migration policy, a point recognized by the way by the author itself in p. 45.

The end of this second part is even more chaotic. In 2.3 „Souvislosti integračních politik Francie“ pp. 56-65, the author presents a third historical aspect of the French migration policy (after the one on migration and the second on integration) where she discusses the roots of the assimilation approach to the integration of migrants. This short development that should be gathered and articulated within one historical presentation of the migration issues in France, is then followed without any logical bounds by a presentation of the European migration and integration policies (this time gathered together!).

Concerning the content, my remarks go principally to the third part of the work dedicated to the author's analysis itself. The author provides a text analysis of official texts and tries to describe the civic integration in France according to a set of „research criterias“ (which are more indicators) defined thanks to her readings on migration policies. While this criterias are central for her own analysis, the author is very evasive about the way in which they were chosen and defined. Furthermore, this weak aspect of her methodology contrast with the sophisticated presentation of graphs and tables that are supposed to provide the reader with elements to answer to the general problematic.

This research which is neither qualitative nor quantitative (as the author pretends to do) calls for several questions I would like to adress to the candidate during her defense

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

Could you please explain more precisely the way in which your research criterias has been defined.

6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA
(výborně, velmi dobře, dobře, nevyhově!):

Doporučuji k obhajobě. **velmi dobře**

Datum: 1.2.2016

Podpis:

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.