



## REVIEW OF DIPLOMA THESIS

**Review type:** Opponent's Review

**Author of the diploma thesis:** Sofia Smorodina

**Title:** Types of corruption and anti-corruption strategies in Ukraine

**Author of the review:** František Ochrana

---

The thesis aims to examine the phenomenon of corruption and the anti-corruption strategies (the case study of Ukraine. Author of the diploma thesis (Sofia Smorodina) shows how corruption can affect society and what particular measures can be undertaken for tackling this phenomenon. The assessment of diploma thesis is as follows:

1) *Factual benefits of work and its added value;*

Expected benefit is not explicitly defined. Formally, it can be deduced from section 1.1 and the following analysis. The research problem is „to find out current status of corruption in Ukraine“. The goals of the thesis are the following: 1. to find out, which types of corruption exist, 2. to find out, which type of corruption prevail in Ukraine, and 3. to find out, how different anti-corruption measures are efficient in Ukraine“ (p.9).

My comment: The goals have mainly analytical and descriptive features. This reduction has a negative impact on the added value of diploma thesis. My question (**Q1**) is: what is the added value for scientific theory? And what is factual benefit of work? Is this the goal “how different anti-corruption measures are efficient in Ukraine?“ I believe that this objective has not been fully achieved.

2) *Setting and answering research questions;*

The research questions of the thesis are the following:

RQ1: based on the results of the research, what are the main reasons of corruption in Ukraine?

RQ2: what measures should be done and what relevant anti-corruption measures can be implemented to prevent corruption in Ukraine?

My comment: The research questions logically follow the objectives. That's correct. However, research questions are based only on an analysis of secondary sources. I would recommend using other research methods (e.g. interviews). This option (opportunity) has not been used.



3) *Structure of work;*

*The structure of the work is in line with research issues, objectives and research questions. I have the following comments:*

- a) *The logic of points 2.2.2 and 2.2.3. is not clear. Why is individual corruption classified behind systemic corruption? (Q 2).*
- b) *Some parts of the thesis are disproportional. (See e.g. part 4). This part of the thesis is brief.*
- c) *The research problem, the aim and the goals (pp. 80-81, see "conclusion") are repeated (see section 1.1).*

4) *The factual accuracy and convincing of the argumentation;*

*No comment.*

5) *Sophistication and application of theoretical approaches;*

*The theoretic-methodological approach is based on the traditional paradigm (Rothstein, Vannucci, Rose-Ackerman, Klitgaard). Key categories and concepts are: types of corruption (petty corruption, individual corruption, systemic corruption, structure corruption), levels of corruption and anti-corruption strategies. This analysis is quite good. However, I have this comment: The current discussion in scientific journals has gone unused.*

6) *Methodological approach and application of particular methods and approaches;*

*Key categories rely on the texts of known authorities. It is a pity that the content of the theoretical-methodological framework has not been enriched by a rich scientific discussion about corruption in Ukraine. The key method is the case study (Case study – corruption in Ukraine). The investigation of corruption is based primarily on the analysis of documents. Primary (own) empirical research was not used. What's the reason? (Q 3).*

7) *Use of literature and data;*

*Sofia Smorodina uses information from various research centres and institutions (WB, OECD, TI, Wilson Center, etc.). Analysis from these sources is good. But the analysis of the scientific articles is inadequate. For example: web of science database (keywords: "corruption, Ukraine") contains 285 publications (41 articles were published in 2020 and 51 articles were published in 2019). How many of these articles are analysed in literature review? (Q 4). Finally, I note that the primary data was not used.*

8) *Stylistic and text editing (quote, text layout, etc.).*

*I have no significant objections. I have some small comments: Authors are mentioned differently (inconsistent citation); see e.g. ROTHSTEIN, Bo..., Elliott, K. A....*



9) *Question for defense (not obligatory)*

*Question for defense - see Q 1, Q 2, Q3 and Q 4.*

**For the above reasons, I recommend the diploma thesis for the defense.**

**My grading is "D".**

Date: 26 January 2021

Signature: 

Prof. František Ochrana

