Name of the student:	Yinka Azeez Adenuga
Title of the thesis:	Determinant of Migration Among Africans in the Czech Republic
Reviewer:	PhDr. Barbora Menclová, Ph.D.

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD
(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

Migration from African countries to their European counterparts is a frequently researched topic in Western European academia. Due to its growing importance, it has also received more attention in recent years from researchers working in the Czech Republic. However, there are still no overview studies on this community, as the author demonstrates. For this reason, the research on this topic is relevant and beneficial to contemporary knowledge. However, the research question could be formulated more widely given the lack of basic knowledge about this community living in Czechia. While the author states that he will also examine general features of the composition and structures of migrants from African states, he retains motivation as the primary goal. Therefore, some objectives are too ambitious (see p. 3), given that he focuses mainly on one aspect. A more detailed description of the research subject (e.g., why the three African countries were selected for the case study?) might help better understand the research scope. In the literature review, the author shows a sufficient orientation to the case, including familiarity with sources in the Czech language.

2. ANALYSIS
(methodology, argument, theoretical backing, appropriate work with sources):

A complication at the beginning of the research was the lack of secondary sources. However, the author gathered sufficient primary sources and presented some more general findings about the migrants from African states. The methods chosen - document analysis and interviews - are relevant. In particular, the outcomes from the interviews are valuable. Still, they would be more convincing if they were analyzed in a broader context (together with general information about the migrants from selected African states). Regarding the structure of the thesis, some parts are not logically ordered, where more detailed facts based on the research are described first, followed by more general information (see Chapter 2.2).

3. CONCLUSIONS
(persuasiveness, link between data and conclusions, achievement of research objectives):

There is a clear link between the data and the conclusions. Most of the research objectives were achieved, although if the research question had been formulated broader, it might have offered a more detailed and complex conclusion.

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE
(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

The author uses appropriate language following the academic standards. However, there are repeating grammar errors (e.g., small letters instead of capitals and vice versa, punctuation). As a more major mistake, I see uncompleted citation apparatus – notes and bibliography, where, for example, the number of pages or, in some cases, names of documents are missing.

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT
(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

The thesis contributes partly to current scientific research on the African community living in the Czech Republic. The author has dealt with the lack of secondary literature by analyzing primary sources, including official documents. The result is primarily a study of the motivations of selected migrants, but it also brings some new, more general findings about the African community. Nevertheless, more attention could have been paid to the definition of the research subject, the connection of the outcomes with a broader context, and the structure. Another weak point is repeating grammatical errors. A significant deficiency is the incomplete reference apparatus, which complicates the verification of claims.

Grade (A-F):	D
Date:	Signature:

classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
A (91–100)	91–100 %	8,5%	5	6,7%	8,5–10	5,3%	9–10	5,5 %
B (81–90)	81–90 %	16,3%	4,5	11,7%	7,5–8,4	16.4%	8–8,9	11,0 %
C (71–80)	71–80 %	16,3%	4	20%	6,5–7,4	36,2%	7–7,9	18,4 %
D (61–70)	61–70 %	24%	3,5	28,3%			6–6,9	35,2 %
E (51–60)	51–60 %	34,9%	3	33,4 %	6–6,4	42,1 %	5–5,9	30,1 %

Assessment criteria:

Excellent (A): "Outstanding performance with only minor errors";
Very good (B): "Above the average standard but with some errors";
Good (C): "Generally sound work but with a number of notable errors";
Satisfactory (D): "Fair but with significant shortcomings";
Sufficient (E): "Performance meets the minimum criteria";
Fail: "Some/considerable more work required before the credit can be awarded".