

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

<b>Thesis title:</b>	Public Opinion on Migration within the European Union: A Statistical Analysis of the Key Factors
<b>Student's name:</b>	Šimon Hájek
<b>Referee's name:</b>	Petr Špecián

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
<b>Major Criteria</b>			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	<b>50</b>	37
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	<b>15</b>	12
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	<b>15</b>	12
<b>Total</b>		<b>80</b>	61
<b>Minor Criteria</b>			
	Sources, literature	<b>10</b>	9
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	<b>5</b>	4
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	<b>5</b>	4
<b>Total</b>		<b>20</b>	17
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>100</b>	78

**Plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score: 16 %**

*[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.*

Visual inspection of the results revealed no problematic cases.

**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):

Šimon Hájek's thesis "Public Opinion on Migration within the European Union: A Statistical Analysis of the Key Factors" addresses a timely topic in contemporary European politics. The work represents a solid attempt at an independent analysis of a complex theme, demonstrating the author's academic competence. Let me summarize my impressions of the thesis, starting with its strengths and then proceeding to areas for improvement.

Strengths:

1. The thesis is well-structured and thus easy to navigate. This logical organization and the author's solid explanatory capability provide for good overall readability.
2. The author diligently explains his basic concepts and methodological decisions throughout the thesis. While not all explanations are equally persuasive, the commitment to transparency in the research process is commendable.
3. The work engages with a relatively broad range of up-to-date scholarly literature, indicating the author's awareness of current debates and research in the field. (Unfortunately, the bibliography is badly formatted and difficult to navigate.)
4. The author's choice of proxies is well-explained (ch. 3).
5. I appreciate that the thesis does not gloss over limitations and difficulties encountered during the research process. This transparency, along with discussions of mitigation strategies, adds credibility to the work and demonstrates the author's critical thinking skills.

#### Areas for Improvement:

1. The structure, while clear, deviates from the conventions habitual for bachelor's theses by placing the research design before the literature review. While this works for many a research paper, a more traditional ordering of themes would be preferable in the specific genre of a thesis.
2. Section 1.3 on limitations and ethical considerations is too generic and offers limited insight. Moreover, the use of future tense in this section is inconsistent with the completed nature of the research, suggesting this part of the thesis may have been somewhat neglected.
3. The thesis would benefit from a more comprehensive exploration of public opinion research in the beginning of Chapter 2. Compared to the detailed examination of selected "factors of examination" in later sections, this opening remains underdeveloped.
4. The thesis lacks a clear overview of hypotheses, their operationalization, and a description of the statistical models and methods employed.
5. The author's handling of statistical tools, while workable for a bachelor's thesis, suggests some degree of uncertainty. For instance, the discussion of  $R^2$  and statistical significance on p. 20 is misleading.
6. While the discussion of results is generally satisfactory, there are instances where the author seems to expect more from his methods than they can realistically deliver (e.g., p. 18). The complex nature of the phenomena under study means that outliers or exceptions to simple explanations should not be surprising, and may not always require speculative explanations.
7. The analysis operates at a high level of abstraction, which limits its ability to provide insights about individual respondents. The author should exercise more caution when making claims at the individual level, such as on p. 25.
8. The list of sources is not well-formatted and the references occasionally lack some information, hindering easy readability.
9. The presence of typos, occasional lack of clarity in language, and unnecessarily convoluted sentences harm the otherwise good readability of the thesis. More thorough proofreading would be welcome.

Overall, while there are areas that would benefit from refinement, particularly in terms of methodological clarity and language precision, the work demonstrates the author's ability to engage with current literature and conduct independent research. I assess the thesis as a "good C" work. Conditional on a persuasive defense, I think B could also be within the author's reach.

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

#### **Suggested questions for the defence are:**

Your results show that economic factors have less influence on migration attitudes than expected. How do you reconcile this with the prominence of economic arguments in public discourse about migration?

Regarding your use of AI, particularly in the EU Political Barometer data: How specifically did you use it? What steps did you take to ensure the reliability and validity of the results?

**I recommend the thesis for final defence.**

---

***Referee Signature***

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

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