

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): Marcela Vošťřaková

Název práce: **Norská imigrační politika roce 2011**

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):

The candidate discusses the changes that occurred in the Norwegian migration policies after 2011. Drawing from two theoretical anchorages (Punctuated Equilibrium Theory and Advocacy Coalition Framework) the work proposes to determine the nature of the legislative changes that define the migration policy in Norway as well as its social and political origins.

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

The analysis builds at first on legislative acts. An important part of the development recalls the several elements of the migration's law and its changes between 2008 and 2015. Second, the thesis builds on general debates in the media between 2011 (before and just after the terrorist attack perpetrated by Andres Breivik) and 2015.

Concerning the structure, the thesis opens with theoretical chapters followed with two parts structured chronologically where the authors develops the legal frame, the political context and the general debates that occurred in the societies just before and after the terrorist attack

The literature on migration is far from being extensive, almost none of the references that make authorities in the field are quoted. The majority of the articles chosen for the analysis concerns exclusively Norway. For a subject that is by understood by the recent research as a global issue, the absence of references (but a very few of them for instance Barša a Baršová, 2005) dealing with migration studies in transnational or/and comparative views calls for questions.

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 won't 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 at first the chapter „Výzkumný rámec“:

The logic of this part is not easy to follow, since the terminology and the theoretical anchorage are discussed by the author before the presentation of the general question and the hypothesis of the thesis. This is particularly surprising since the theoretical anchorage is supposed to carry out the general demonstration of the processes (legislative evolution) that is analyzed.

Furthermore, the methodology of the work is pretty short (one page) and evasive, drawing on a set of mysterious „research criterias“ which role for the purpose of the thesis and justification (why those criterias and not others?) are almost not discussed.

The progression of the development in the detail (visible from the table of contents) doesn't avoid redundancies between part 2 and 3. Additionally, some titles don't reflect the content: the two chapters for instance „Social and cultural situation in Norway“ (2.3 and 3.3) present in reality general issues on migration, integration and multiculturalism that are discussed in the media and the public scene.

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

I would like to address two questions to the candidate:

- On the methodology: could you please explain more precisely how your research criteria have been chosen?
- The candidate seems to have a good understanding of the political context in Norway. Migration policies can't be fully understood without referring to the international context and the recent trends followed by European member states (Norway is not a member state but a Schengen country) concerning migration's regulation and integration policies.

Could you please recall them briefly and compare them to the one you observed during your research on Norway?

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

Doporučuji k obhajobě. **velmi dobře**

Datum: 6.6.2016

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.