



## POSUDEK BAKALÁŘSKÉ/MAGISTERSKÉ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE

### Posudek vedoucího práce/oponenta

Autor práce: Olga Vlasová

Název práce: Unconditional Basic Income - new utopia/dystopia of modernity

Autor posudku: Jaromír Mazák

Návrh klasifikace práce: *výborně*

#### Základní charakteristika práce.

Since the work is written in English, I will allow myself the pleasure of writing my review of it in the same language.

In the theoretical part, the author introduces the idea of universal basic income as a multifaceted concept with important economic, ethical, social, private, and political concerns. In the empirical part, the author draws on two primary data sources: her own content analysis of media articles about UBI and her own questionnaire survey conducted with a help of a surveying agency. The contribution of the empirical part is both creating insight into the public discourses about UBI in the Czech Republic and linking media discourse with public opinion.

Overall, the quality of this thesis is very high in terms of its theoretical scope, own empirical contribution and both language and visual communication.

I suggest classifying it with an A (*výborně*).

### KONCEPČNÍ STRÁNKA PRÁCE

#### Má práce jasně formulovaný záměr, cíl, výzkumnou otázku a odpovídají jim závěry?

The thesis has a clearly stated goal: answering the research question of 'how is the UBI concept reflected and presented in Czech media and public discourses?'. I find that this goal is interesting since intuitively the topic seems under-represented in the Czech Republic. But is mostly worth the academic effort as the concept has received some serious consideration in the recent past in other countries and may yet play an important role in the social policies to come. The goal of the thesis is well fulfilled.

#### Má práce adekvátně stanovenou a jasně vyloženou metodu a postup řešení?

The thesis has a standard structure of two main parts, a theoretical and an empirical, and a conclusion. Its method is clear. The author first conducts a survey of arguments, both supportive and dismissive, as they appear in academic literature, and confronts them with existing empirical evidence, where possible. She then draws on these arguments to design her own content analysis form for media analysis and questionnaire for the public. The data collected by these two instruments are then analysed and valid conclusions are made.

**Jsou jednotlivé části práce (zejm. teoretická a empirická) vyvážené a vhodně propojené, vytváří text konzistentní celek?**

Yes, this question was already answered in the paragraph above.

**Jsou argumentace a text práce a vystavěny logicky, jasně, srozumitelně? Má práce přehlednou strukturu?**

Yes, this question was already answered in the paragraph above.

## OBSAH PRÁCE

**Hodnocení kvality teoretické části práce** (relevance k tématu a záměru práce, šíře a hloubka, vhléd autora do problematiky, samostatnost, originalita zpracování,...).

The discussion about UBI is broad and may be hard to navigate. The author contains this challenge by structuring it into five sub-chapters: economic, ethical, social, private, and political. This solution works quite well, even though some arguments in some of these sub-chapters are necessarily just slightly different flavours of what the reader may also taste in other sub-chapters. This is not too surprising, the rationale behind some claims about economic feasibility is similar to that behind claims about UBI's impact on inequality. Other arguments are on the boarder of the ethical and the private etc. But even if there may be ways to re-structure the theoretical part in a more concise manner, the small overlaps are not distracting and may in fact help the reader grasp the multidimensionality of the concept. Overall, the theoretical part of the thesis is clear, engaging and I especially value the way how it closes with a visually pleasing summary of its implications for own empirical research. The bridge between the theoretical and the empirical part is hence strong.

**Hodnocení kvality empirické části práce** (adekvátnost použitých metod a postupů vzhledem k cíli práce, správnost aplikace metod a postupů, prezentace a interpretace výsledků,...).

The empirical part is based on a combination of two primary (i.e. collected by the author) data sources: content analysis and questionnaire survey. The content analysis is mainly an exploratory description. I appreciate the readable charts and also the author's openness to take my nudge and learn new software in order to conduct the rather unusual visual combination of correlation matrix and hierarchical cluster analysis in one picture (Graph 7). The analysis of the survey data goes beyond description and includes some hypothesis testing. This is conducted in a standard manner for a two-way analysis with combination of plots and chi-square tests.

There are some minor issues which may be a little confusing. For example, the term public discourse is used for the public opinion reflected in the questionnaire survey and opposed to the media discourse. The usual understanding of the term public discourse would cover both media discourse and public opinion. This may be especially confusing as the opinion about individual arguments about UBI was solicited even from those who did not originally know what it was and had to decide after just a very short introduction of the concept.

In the questionnaire survey, I like the battery about the extent to which individual arguments are convincing. This battery may indicate the starting position of the Czech population towards the concept, even if people are not yet familiar with it.

What is methodologically more problematic, but also interesting, is the battery about having noticed individual arguments in the media. Generally, I would advise scepticism about people's ability to recall this. However, the content analysis shows that there is some correlation. I would like to see some more reflection on the trustworthiness of this set of questions and what the combination of content analysis and questionnaire survey can and cannot tell us.

**Hodnocení diskuse a závěrů práce** (soulad interpretací a závěrů s výsledky empirických analýz, provedení diskuse závěrů, snaha o vysvětlení závěrů a jejich argumentace, zodpovězení výzkumných otázek, naplnění cílů práce).

The conclusion is successful in highlighting the most important findings both descriptive and related to hypotheses testing. I think the result of H4 testing should be made more explicit. It is present in the conclusion, but unlike the other hypotheses, it is not marked with "H4" which makes it seem like it has been omitted.

## FORMÁLNÍ ASPEKTY PRÁCE

**Hodnocení naplnění kritérií odborného textu** (rozsah práce (BP 72-126 tis. znaků, DP 108-162 tis. znaků) citační normy, odkazy, popis datových zdrojů, jasnost odlišení myšlenek autora od převzatých, seznam literatury atd.)

There are no major formal issues with the thesis.

**Hodnocení vhodnosti a úplnosti využití informačních zdrojů** (literární prameny, databáze, zahraniční literatura, datové zdroje,...)

The scope of sources used is very good. Not only in terms of sheer number of books and articles, but mainly in terms of combining theoretical contributions with empirical research papers.

**Hodnocení jazykové, stylistické a grafické úrovně práce** (grafická úprava, členění textu, označení příloh, zpracování tabulek, grafů, schémat atp.)

Like stated above, the thesis is written in a clear language and also the visual elements (graphs, highlighting both in text and in tables) are very helpful for pleasant reading.

### Další poznámky

I appreciate the author's overall attitude throughout writing the thesis when she showed interest in writing as good a thesis as possible and was open to implementing my recommendations even if this meant extra work.

### Celkové hodnocení práce

The author clearly demonstrates very solid ability to read up theory and transform it into concepts to be measured and hypotheses to be tested as well as ability to design a data collection tools, analyse the data and communicate results.

### Otázky a náměty k obhajobě

I would like to hear more reflection about some questions in the questionnaire:

1) What may be some shortcomings of asking respondent about a concept which has just been introduced to them?

2) Can we believe in respondents' ability to recall which arguments they have noticed in the media? Is there anything we can learn about this by looking at the relation between results from content analysis and these questions in the questionnaire?

Further, I would like to hear a closing commentary which takes us back to the preamble. I found the preamble a nice touch to underscore the relevance of UBI by setting it in broader context of social change, but it would be interesting to hear if any ideas can be inferred (or speculated) from the thesis which would inform the more general issues about social change mentioned in the preamble.

Datum:

Podpis: