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

Thesis title:	Public Opinion on Migration within the European Union: A Statistical Analysis of the Key Factors
Student's name:	Šimon Hájek
Referee's name:	PhDr. Jiří Schwarz, Ph.D.

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	**50**	20
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	**15**	13
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	**15**	11
Total		*80*	44
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	**10**	10
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	**5**	4
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	**5**	4
Total		*20*	18
TOTAL		*100*	62

Plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score: 16%
The reviewed thesis is an original work, I could not detect any signs of plagiarism.

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):

The topic of the theses underwent significant development over the course of the past academic year. When Šimon started working on it, he wanted to focus on how migration can help solve the problem of population aging in the EU. He wanted to examine the feasibility of policies enabling it and how these policies are perceived by citizens of the EU countries.

Gradually, the focus shifted more towards the perception side and in the end the thesis' focus is on factors influencing public opinion regarding immigration. In my opinion, this is still close enough to the originally planned topic. Such a focus was narrower, more specific, and therefore more promising.

However, even though it is not a necessity, Šimon practically did not communicate with me and shared the first draft of the thesis on April 28, i.e. two days before the deadline for the June thesis defense. Then, in May, I was informed that the defense was postponed to September, which means, that there is still time to work on the thesis. Therefore, I read the thesis and shared my comments and suggestions at the beginning of June, expecting that Šimon will use the extra two months to further improve the thesis. Unfortunately, the final to-be-defended version does not substantially differ from the May version and does not take into account the vast majority of my comments. I state this to explain why my report is rather critical.

Already in the introductory section, the text is rather repetitive. Instead of going right to the core and providing some crucial details – such as the data used, and the main results – it keeps repeating very general statements. Section 1 – Research Design doesn't really explain the specifics of the analysis, such as the source of the data used or the concrete methods and their assumptions. The biggest issue I have with the analysis itself is that Šimon doesn't convincingly explain why he decided to run a set of regressions with a single explanatory variable, even though he himself writes in the Conclusion that "These results indicate that several independent variables are required to influence a respondent simultaneously in order for the to shift public opinion in relation to migration." Why not formulate a more holistic model which would include more factors at once?

The best aspect of the thesis is the whole section 2 – Literature Review. It provides a very nice a thorough overview of literature focusing on various aspects influencing public opinion on migration. There are just some inconsistencies in citing the literature (sometimes first names are used, sometimes not, etc.), but nothing major.

But the rest of the thesis, focusing on the description of the analysis and on the analysis itself, is rather lacking. E.g. no details regarding the used data are provided, no summary statistics are reported. I couldn't even find from which year the data is and if it is the same year for all the used variables. Given the low number of observations, the inability to obtain statistically significant results is not surprising. Even though not obtaining any statistically significant results is not a problem per se, the quality of the analysis is relatively low and the choices related to data and methodology are not properly explained. The chosen methods are not necessarily incorrect, they are just not utilized properly. It might be the case that the choices were motivated by the limited availability of data. But this is not explained anywhere in the thesis.

As a consequence, the contribution of the thesis is – in my opinion – very limited.

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

Suggested questions for the defence are:

Describe the data you use in your analysis and defend your methodological approach.

I 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.