

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

Thesis title:	Formation for a dying world: how young university students navigate the socio-ecological crisis and perceive their role in the future
Student's name:	Anna Bruno
Referee's name:	Mgr. Jakub Tesař, Ph.D.

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	50	45
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	15	15
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	15	13
<i>Total</i>		80	73
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	10	9
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	5	5
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	5	5
<i>Total</i>		20	19
TOTAL		100	92

Plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score:

13% Turnitin - all references are properly used and cited.

Reviewer's commentary according to the above criteria

The thesis aims to understand the “contradiction between personal perception of the current socio-ecological crisis and action of young university students by analyzing the narrative behind their present and future imaginaries” (p. 23). The author explores explicitly how factors of work, isolation, control, and comfort contribute to this contradiction.

The thesis explores one of the big questions of the current world (probably THE question of today) - social inaction in the face of an unfolding socio-ecological crisis. The author did a great job in situating the thesis in a broad context of critical scholarship on modernity and narrowing it down to a manageable research puzzle. The analysis is based on semi-structured interviews, which are well-elaborated and provide rich empirical data for the analysis. The analysis is well structured according to the four topics (effectively hypotheses regarding what causes the discrepancy between perception and action) and provides genuine insights. In my view, the number of interviews has not significantly (negatively) impacted the nature of the conclusions (but some diversity may be lost).

Throughout the thesis, the author pays great attention to the limitations of the selected approach and takes them into account when presenting the findings.

As regards some limitations, I have two main points and some smaller comments. I believe the thesis could better engage with academic literature exploring the topic on the empirical level. The text is rich in theoretical reflection, but there is already excellent scholarship on how the future is imagined, how our perception shapes our actions, etc. Reviewing such works (on top of the theoretical argument) could have better informed the performed analysis. Secondly, there is a lack of coherence between the (rich) theoretical framework and the actual analysis. In an ideal thesis, the analytical framework would directly build on the theoretical argument, e.g., the four “constraints” would have been directly deduced from theorizing the problem. Careful readers will find how many aspects follow. Still, the author does not provide a direct link, and some parts of the frameworks seem not to be reflected in the analysis (e.g., the notion of time and space – how is it reflected in the four studied factors). In this sense, the assumptions (sec 4.1) could have been better placed before the analytical part of the thesis. The semi-structured interview is elaborated, but it would be helpful to learn more about how it has been constructed (why certain parts are there and why it is organized the way it is). The thesis is vague regarding the analytical technique (narrative analysis, p. 28), and it is therefore unclear how it reached its conclusions. The findings are, however, insightful and convincing.

Concerning formal criteria, the thesis presents a clear, very self-reflective argument. However, the transition between individual sections could be improved. The manuscript lacks page numbers, which complicates navigating it. The author uses the references well, but the bibliography has many inconsistencies (books miss information on the publisher, issue info for articles is presented in various formats, etc.)

Altogether, the thesis deals with a crucial question of today's politics, and Anna executed it well to get genuine insights into the environmental inaction of the crucial cohort. I am glad I witnessed the process of this thesis taking shape out of the original vague idea.

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

Suggested questions for the defence are:

- Your theoretical framework seems to suggest there is a very limited agency of people embedded in processes of modernity. In that case, does research puzzle really present a contradiction?
- I was not entirely convinced by the absolute critique of basic needs/rights discourse. I share the notion that the discourse in many aspects problematics, but once stripped the known problems (needs for quantification, claims of universalism, ...) in my view it reflects genuine (material) human necessities. In my opinion, it is a question of whether the discourse (shared structure of meaning) goes “all the way down” or whether we will find some other aspect (material) at the end. What do you think?

I recommend the thesis for final defence.

Referee Signature