BACHELOR'S THESIS EXAMINER REPORT
PPE – Bachelor's in Politics, Philosophy and Economics
Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Thesis title:	**The collective-risk social dilemma in two stages; an experimental analysis of the effects of discounting contributions and in-group differences in risk.**
Student's name:	**Mees de Rijk**
Referee's name:	**Jan Kofron**

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	**50**	48
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	**15**	14
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	**15**	14
Total		*80*	76
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	**10**	10
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	**5**	4
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	**5**	3
Total		*20*	17
TOTAL		*100*	93

Plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score:
[NB:] If the plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score is above 15%, the reviewer has to include his/her assessment of the originality of the reviewed thesis in his/her review.

Reviewer's commentary according to the above criteria (min. 1800 characters including spaces when recommending a passing grade, min. 2500 characters including spaces when recommending a failing grade): It is one of the most intriguing BA level thesis I have read. The research puzzle is interesting and politically relevant. It is well framed within existing literature. The structure of the thesis as well as the methods used ale appropriate. I need to explicitly appreciate that the student has decided to run an experiment and was able to actually do it (that is quite rare at' the BA level).
There are some weaker points, however. First, there is the chapter on methodology, and then subsequent chapter on the Experiment. What is my problem? After reading methodology I had no clue what the author actually did. I needed to read the chapter on the experiment to understand it. So one wonders, if the Logic of experiment should not go first. Second, the introduction reads already as a mini literature review – I am not sure if this is the best option (nevertheless this is more a subjective preference). Third, while the work is generally good as far as technical side is considered, some tables (p. 17 and 19)

are mediocre at best (just a little bit of formating would do the magic here). Obviously, oné could argue that a bigger sample (and possibly a sample including also non-students) would improve the strength and generalizibility of the thesis, nevertheless the author as a student faced some objective constrains.

All in all, this is a great BA level thesis. As I se it, it is a thesis that deserves a high grade, some minor issues notwithstanding.

Proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F): A

Suggested questions for the defence are:

I (do not) recommend the thesis for final defence.

_____
Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Quality standard
91 – 100	**A**	= outstanding (high honor)
81 – 90	**B**	= superior (honor)
71 – 80	**C**	= good
61 – 70	**D**	= satisfactory
51 – 60	**E**	= low pass at a margin of failure
0 – 50	**F**	= failing. The thesis is not recommended for defence.