



Posudek na diplomovou práci

Autor/ka práce: Matej Žganec

Název práce: Policy determinants in the context of the EU's carbon neutrality goals

Obor/Rok: MV 2021

Autor posudku (oponent): Jan Mazač

Kritéria	Definice	Max. bodů	Získané body
Hlavní kritéria			
	Výzkumná otázka, formulace problému	10	10
	Teoretický konceptuální rámec	30	26
	Metodologie, analýza argumentace	40	37
<i>Celkem</i>		80	73
Vedlejší kritéria			
	Zdroje	10	10
	Styl	5	5
	Formální kritéria	5	5
<i>Celkem</i>		20	20
CELKEM		100	93



Slovní hodnocení:

Hlavní kritéria:

The author crafted an outstanding and well-written master's thesis intending to find out (via the method of logistic regression) what influences decision-makers in small and medium-sized European cities to adopt the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMP). Although I have some critical comments, there are only minor ones.

First, I would like to appreciate the clearly circumscribed subject of the study – RQ and all tested hypotheses - built on the existing body of literature and aiming to fill the identified research gap. I like the way the author approaches his research as he, in the first step, identifies several conclusions presented in relevant papers in the past. Then, he attempts to validate whether they are generalizable using a quantitative approach (logit regression).

Second, the theoretical chapter is robust and well-structured, and it provides a comprehensible overview of all nine hypotheses. Some hypotheses stem from various theoretical approaches (e.g., policy diffusion theory), some from concepts like Europeanisation or follow the outcomes of current literature (voting patterns of political fractions in the EP, influence of Greens/gender on adoption of sustainable policies at local level).

Third, the delimitation of the central concept, SUMP, is also sufficient. On the one hand, I value the historical overview of transport planning and comparing the SUMP concept with a traditional way of planning. On the other, I lack information on why SUMP are highly prioritised EU policy tools for GHG reduction (page 59), or on the successes of SUMP (as the author mentions on page 14) that make the other non-EU countries adopt similar strategic plans. Although the quality of implementation of SUMP is not part of the study, a brief overview of their implementation would put SUMP better in the context of city mobility planning and show why it is worth studying it. Therefore, are there any measurable outcomes/targets (besides adoption) already achieved (e.g., GHG reduction, better air quality, fixed problems)? Since monitoring and evaluation is an essential part of the concept, I would expect there are already available reports mapping the progress.

Fourth, the methodological and analytical part is satisfactory, well-structured, and logically organised – the way of city selection and the selection of independent variables is also sufficient. Regarding the method used (binomial logistic regression), I think it would be valuable to provide a more expansive description of the method as such, and add more information on reliability checks and their interpretation (Akaik information criterion and Variance inflation factor assessing the linear relation of variables). It is not clear why the author also conducts the Probit model. Unfortunately, he does not explain the rationale behind his additional choice nor interpret the outcomes of it. Does the logit model fit the purpose better or not? I also do not understand why the author runs OLS regression (as a robustness check). Is it appropriate to run it to model a dichotomous dependent variable?



**FAKULTA
SOCIÁLNÍCH VĚD**
Univerzita Karlova

Vedlejší kritéria:

The thesis is well formatted and structured, the writing style is clear and the grammar satisfactory. It also corresponds with the formal requirements.

Celkové hodnocení:

This is a well-crafted master's thesis, providing a comprehensive analysis of what influences decision-makers in small and medium-sized European cities to adopt SUMP. The author performs solid empirical analysis with a strong theoretical and conceptual foundation. I appreciate that the inquiry further elaborates on current research and attempts to fill the identified gap. The author also realises the limitation of his study, which might have impacted or influenced the interpretation of the findings.

Výsledná známka: A

Podpis:

Jan Mazač