



## MASTER THESIS'S REVIEW

**Type of the review:** supervisor's review

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

**Title of the reviewed thesis:**

„Types of corruption and anti-corruption strategies in Ukraine“

**Author of the review:** Doc. PhDr. Pavol Frič, PhD.

---

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

The assessed master thesis focuses its attention on the study of corruption and the anti-corruption strategies in Ukraine. For her research, the author tries to create an analytical tool in the form of a typology of corruption and a typology of anti-corruption strategies against the background of theoretical approaches to corruption. To identify the types of corruption in Ukrainian society, the author uses empirical data from the CPI and various public opinion polls. However, the finding of the presence of individual types of corruption in Ukrainian society no longer continues to confront these types with the identified types of anti-corruption strategies. The results of the corruption analysis thus remained unused for the subsequent analysis of the effectiveness of anti-corruption strategies. The author's recommendations for addressing the issue of applying appropriate anti-corruption strategies are not based on her own findings. The author's approach then has the character of a survey study rather than an analysis of the subject of its research.

### 2) *Determination of research questions and their answers;*

The main problem of the thesis is its conceptual ambiguity and inconsistency. On page 9, the author states:

*„The research problem of this thesis is to find out current status of corruption in Ukraine. The aim of the thesis is to find out, which types of corruption prevail in Ukraine in the last twenty years and nowadays.“*

It is not clear from the text of the thesis what the author considers to be the "current status of corruption". This status is not mentioned in the theoretical part either. The relationship between the research problem and the aim of the thesis is also not entirely clear and consistent. Moreover, the aim does not contain the second part of what the Abstract of the thesis declares, ie the orientation towards the study of anticorruption strategies.



The relationship between the aim of the thesis and research questions on the page 9 is unclear:

„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?“

The aim of the thesis do not include aspiration to find out reasons of corruption. The second research question then goes beyond the search for the status or types of corruption.

### **3) The structure of the thesis;**

The structure of the theis is standard. The work is divided into three main chapters. An overview of theoretical approaches to the study of corruption and anti-corruption strategies is contained in the second Chapter, and it can be stated that this overview is quite successful. The empirically focused third Chapter is a key part of the thesis. It is devoted to the presentation of opinion polls and other data sources that illustrate the picture of corruption and anti-corruption efforts in Ukraine. Again, I must reiterate that this is an overview rather than a methodically "diagnosis" of corruption or anti-corruption strategies.

### **4) Factual correctness and persuasiveness of the argument;**

The author concludes that *"institutional approach... should be one of the first steps in the fight against corruption and the creation of an anti-corruption strategy."* (45) *"... an independent, authoritative state body should be created..."* However in her thesis, she stated several times that the institutions that had been set up to fight corruption had not yet succeeded and that *'The level of corruption remains high!'* (64) In principle, I lack an explanation of what anti-corruption approach is appropriate for tackling the systemic corruption that is typical of Ukraine.

### **5) Elaboration and application of theoretical starting points and approaches;**

It is the theoretical chapter that represents the strongest aspect of the work. On the other hand, the theoretical tools for examining anti-corruption strategies, which this part involve, were not applied in the analysis of anti-corruption strategies implemented in Ukraine.

### **6) Methodological approach and application of individual methods;**

The methdological approach is baed on a secondary analysis of different types of data with different level of validity. I miss the concrete sources descriptons and discussion of their validity.

### **7) Use of literature and data;**

The author used a sufficient range of relevant literature. The elaboration and presentation of the used literature can be assessed as satisfactory.

### **8) Stylistics and formal processing (citations, graphic design, etc.).**



From a stylistic point of view, the thesis can be assessed as good. I did not notice more frequent typos or inconsistent phrases or incorrect sentence structures.

**Questions for discussion**

Could the author explain why she recommends the institutional approach to tackling corruption in Ukraine, despite the fact that it has not been successful anywhere in the post-communist world so far?

**Based on the above, I evaluate the text assessed by the thesis with the grade "E" and I recommend accepting it for defense.**

Date: 3. 2. 2020

Signature: Pavol Frič