

Thesis Reviewer's Report

Student: Asuah Zakari Akurigo
 Title: Socio-economic Context of Migration
 Supervisor: prof. Ing. Jaroslav Macháček, CSc.
 Reviewer: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Viktor Prokop
 Reviewer's job title: Associate Professor, Science and Research Centre, FEA, UPCE

Assessment criteria

	excellent	very good	acceptable	unacceptable	N/A
Achievement of the aims of the thesis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of appropriate methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Depth of analysis (in relation to the topic)	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Structure and extent of the thesis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of Czech and foreign sources (including references)	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Formal aspects (text, diagrams, charts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality of language (style, grammar, terminology)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Usability of the results

	high	medium	low	N/A
In theory	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other comments

The author chose a relevant topic for his thesis and researched the Socio-economic Context of Migration. The diploma thesis begins with the chapter State of art in the research area, however, this chapter looks more like a theoretical background. The following chapter is devoted to the theoretical definition of migration. I would recommend the author to first state the basic definitions and concepts, then define the theoretical directions. A summary of theoretical concepts is given on page 27 - the author could, as his own contribution, create an overview table where he would compare the described concepts.

Overall, the theoretical framework is confusing, the order of the chapters and subchapters should be arranged more logically, some subchapters should be organized more clearly, in other parts the author should add another division to subchapters. An example is the passage from pages 34-40.

The author declares in the introduction that he will deal with the Czech Republic. It would be appropriate if the theoretical framework was placed more in the context of, for example, Europe or Central and Eastern Europe, or the issues of global migration, European migration, migration inside and outside the Czech Republic were more clearly separated.

Last date and time of printout 31.5.2022 14:18

In section 3.4, the author states why the Czech Republic was chosen. The author should inform the reader in much more detail about the researched area. For example, what are the historical experiences of the Czech Republic with (economic) migration? Why did the author choose that the Czech Republic is a representative of CEE countries? What are the reasons for this statement? Is it possible to apply the results for one country to this whole territory?

The analytical part is very confusing, the author presents a large amount of information that is not logically arranged and presented. In some passages, the reader may think that the author primarily analyzes the whole of Europe.

In the fifth part (discussion), the author should discuss the research questions he asks on page 13 (introduction) much more clearly.

The conclusion should be a separate chapter.

The recommendations on page 93 should be elaborated in more detail - for example - the author states that "*It is recommended that the Czech government should improvise a local content for the indigenous or native in the area of employment opportunities.*" The author should explain what he means by this statement.

Returning to section 3.4 (page 51), where the author states that the Czech Republic is a representative of CEE countries, as one of the arguments for choosing this country - the author could also suggest implications for public policy makers in CEE countries.

I also consider the formal aspects of this thesis to be a major weakness of this thesis - the author uses different font formats, different markings, presents numbers in the same tables differently etc. (see examples - page 61 - Table 4 - Western vs. Northern Europe; Graph 11 (page 84) - I cannot read the labels in the graph).

Questions and suggestions for the defence

1. The author should respond to the above comments.
2. The author should clearly answer each of the research questions he asked on page 13.
3. What are the practical implications and recommendations of your research for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe?

Overall evaluation

I **recommend** the thesis for defence.

The proposed grade for the thesis: E

In Pardubice on 31.5.2022

Signature