EPS { European Politics and Society

Name of the student:	
	Yinka Adenuga
Title of the thesis:	**DETERMINANT OF MIGRATION AMONG AFRICANS IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC**
Reviewer:	Anne-Isabelle Richard

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD
(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

> The thesis aims to shed led on the reasons why African migrants go to the Czech Republic. This is a relevant question. The thesis is based on a large amount of secondary literature. The way the literature review deals with this literature review can sometimes be questioned, see below under theoretical framework.

2. ANALYSIS
(methodology, argument, theoretical backing, appropriate work with sources):

> The question of how the research question is operationalised is questionable. On the one hand in relation to the theoretical framework and on the other hand to the sources.
> The two theories chosen are not convincing. In the introduction a number of factors are mentioned that the literature describes as important. Why not just use those theories? Now a factor that was not in the conceptual framework, but was one of the factors mentioned in the literature (security), turns out to be important. Would that not have been an obvious category to use to begin with? That would situate your thesis clearly in the existing literature.
>
> The first description of intersectionality (Thimm&Chauduri) is not convincing and contradicted just after. The second definition makes sense.
> However, why is intersectionality summarised as social factors? When these are mentioned on p. 3, you had not explained about intersectionality (although that would not have explained this terminology either, but at least it would have appeared before).
>
> You do not explain how you arrive at the categories of the life course theory of the theoretical model.
>
> You critique both theories quite harshly at the end of each section, this raises the question (again) why use them?
>
> The definition of migration comes too late.
> Sources: The thesis used semi structured interviews with African migrants in the Czech Republic. That is fine as a method and a lot of literature has been consulted.
> However, we need to know more about the sample of 15 interviewees in order to be able to draw conclusions from this semaple. You need to show how they constitute a representative sample of African migrants in the Czech Republic. Besides nationality that the thesis does discuss, we need to know more about age, education level, gender, race etc.
> It seems the majority of the migrants interviewed were 'expats' rather than 'migrants', i.e. quite highly skilled individuals or students. How representative is this group?
> Are refugees included in the end?
> On p. 32 you mention that the chapter provides a comprehensive empirical analysis of the factors that motive African migrants to migrate. How can this be the case with an N of 15?
> We need more (clearly readable) statistics about numbers and percentages. Stating that the Czech Republic is a popular destination is not enough. The percentages of migrants going to the Czech Republic are minimal in comparison to West European countries. There are reasons for this, and the argument that numbers are increasing is important, but then that needs to be explained.
> You contradict yourself in whether migrants move primarily outside or inside of Africa. No need to use hypothetical language in the literature review – and also, you don't use that language later. Either you describe the debate and then explain why you come out on one side, or if, as is the case here, it is generally agreed that African migrants move mostly within Africa, you can also skip the one source

that disagrees.

3. CONCLUSIONS
(persuasiveness, link between data and conclusions, achievement of research objectives):

Given the problems described above with how the thesis is set up the conclusions claim more than the sources than support. A less ambitious research question with smaller claims in the conclusion would have been more convincing.

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE
(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

The English is problematic and sometimes obscures the meaning. The thesis is quite wordy, it can all be written up more concisely.   The referencing is often not accurate. Also, if you refer to a classic text, give the reference of that classic text, do not refer to someone else who has discussed that classic text, and above all make sure that classic text is in the bibliography. (examples Everett Lee p. 8 Thomas and Znaneck p. 9

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT
(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

The thesis addresses an interesting question about African migration to a country that has traditionally experienced less migration from Africa than other European countries (although see the flourishing literature on connections between the 2nd and 3rd worlds during the Cold War period). However, the problems described above with the operationalisation of the research question make that this thesis is insufficient as it stands.

Grade (A-F):	fail
Date:10 September 2023	Signature:

classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
A (91-100)	91-100 %	8,5%	5	6,7%	8,5-10	5,3%	9-10	5,5 %
B (81-90)	81-90 %	16,3%	4,5	11,7%	7.5-8.4	16.4%	8-8,9	11,0 %
C (71-80)	71-80 %	16,3%	4	20%	6,5-7.4	36,2%	7-7,9	18,4 %
D (61-70)	61-70 %	24%	3,5	28,3%			6-6,9	35,2 %
E (51-60)	51-60 %	34,9%	3	33,4 %	6-6,4	42,1 %	5-5,9	30,1 %

Assessment criteria:

Excellent (A): 'Outstanding performance with only minor errors';
Very good (B): 'Above the average standard but with some errors';
Good (C): 'Generally sound work but with a number of notable errors';
Satisfactory (D): 'Fair but with significant shortcomings';
Sufficient (E): 'Performance meets the minimum criteria';
Fail: 'Some/considerable more work required before the credit can be awarded'.