

REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

IEPS – International Economic and Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Title of the thesis:	The Impact of Political Determinants on Economic Growth: Analysis of AKP Era
Author of the thesis:	Ceren Küçükkayıcı
Referee (incl. titles):	Doc. Ing. Tomáš Cahlík, CSc.

Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the five numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).

1) Theoretical background:

Ceren uses both quantitative and qualitative analysis. She describes in the 1st chapter one of the basic frameworks for the analysis of impact of political determinants on economic growth - the Acemoglu, Johnson & Robinson framework. For her quantitative analysis she uses the Synthetic Control Method.

2) Contribution:

Ceren uses the Synthetic Control Method (SCM) in analyzing the impact of AKP in power in Turkey since 2003 on economic growth of Turkey in this period. She considers it as a case study for a more general link between political determinants and economic growth. This more general link is described in the first chapter with selecting relevant information from literature and is applied later in the interpretation of SCM results. In the second and third chapters Ceren describes political economy in Turkey before and in the AKP era, in the fourth chapter she presents the SCM and in the fifth chapter and Appendices her results.

Contribution would be higher

- if Ceren explained better the SCM and interpreted her results in more detail and
- if she explained better how single chapters fit together.

3) Methods:

Ceren used R for her SCM analysis. She did not use all details that are accessible in the relevant R package but I really appreciate that she learned and used a method that is not standardly taught in her study programme. The weak point is that the results of SCM are sensitive to the braking year – in Ceren's case 2003. She could repeat her analysis with the year 2007 - when the AKP changed its strategy - or maybe with some other year and see if her results are robust enough.

4) Literature:

Ceren has a nice literature review in the 1st chapter and about 50 items in her references. I think she works with literature well.

5) Manuscript form:

Ceren's thesis is formally cultivated, it is well structured and written in a good English. In my opinion, it would be better if her figures were in the text in Chapter 5 and not in the Appendices but I respect her choice.

Box for the thesis supervisor only. I have consulted this thesis quite regularly and often by e-mail

Suggested questions for the defence are:

During defense I suggest discussing the results of her SCM analysis; explanation of her figures is in the most cases just fragmentary and deserves more attention. As a second topic I suggest the interpretation of her results with the use of the Acemoglu, Johnson & Robinson framework.

Summary:

The results of the Urkund analysis do not indicate significant text similarity with other available sources. Ceren has shown the ability to deliver a cultivated text and to use econometric methods on a level appropriate to her study programme. In my view, the thesis fulfills the requirements for a master thesis.

I recommend the thesis for final defence.

SUMMARY OF POINTS AWARDED (for details, see below):

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Theoretical background</i> (max. 20 points)	12
<i>Contribution</i> (max. 20 points)	12
<i>Methods</i> (max. 20 points)	12
<i>Literature</i> (max. 20 points)	20
<i>Manuscript form</i> (max. 20 points)	18
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points)	74
The proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F)	C

DATE OF EVALUATION: August 2nd, 2021

Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Quality standard
91 – 100	A	= outstanding (high honour)
81 – 90	B	= superior (honour)
71 – 80	C	= good
61 – 70	D	= satisfactory
51 – 60	E	= low pass at a margin of failure
0 – 50	F	= failing. The thesis is not recommended for defence.

The referee should give comments to the following requirements:

1) THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: Can you recognize that the thesis was guided by some **theoretical fundamentals** relevant to this thesis topic? Were some important theoretical concepts **omitted**? Was the theory used in the thesis consistently **incorporated with the topic** and hypotheses tested? Has the author demonstrated a genuine **understanding** of the theories addressed?

Strong	Average	Weak	
20	15	< 10	points

2) CONTRIBUTION: Evaluate if the author presents **original ideas** on the topic and aims at demonstrating **critical thinking** and the ability to draw **conclusions** based on the knowledge of relevant theory and relevant empirical material. Is there a distinct **value added** of the thesis (relative to knowledge of a university-educated person interested in given topic)? Did the author explain **why** the observed phenomena occurred? Were the **policy implications** well founded?

Strong	Average	Weak	
20	15	< 10	points

3) METHODS: Are the **hypotheses** for this study clearly stated, allowing their further **verification and testing**? Are the theoretical explanations, empirical material and **analytical tools** used in the thesis relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the aspiration level of the study? Is the thesis **topic comprehensively analyzed** and does the thesis not make trivial or **irrelevant detours** off the main body stated in the thesis proposal? More than 12 points signal an exceptional work, **which requires your explanation "why" it is so**.

Strong	Average	Weak	
20	15	< 10	points

4) LITERATURE REVIEW: The thesis demonstrates the author's full understanding and **command of recent literature**. The author **quotes** relevant literature in a **proper way** and works with a **representative bibliography**. (Remarks: references to Wikipedia, websites and newspaper articles are a sign of **poor research**. If they dominate, you cannot give more than 8 points. References to books published by prestigious publishers and articles in renowned journals give a much better impression. Any sort of **plagiarism** disqualifies the thesis from admission to defence.)

Strong	Average	Weak	
20	15	< 10	points

5) MANUSCRIPT FORM: The thesis is **clear and well structured**. The author uses appropriate **language and style**, including the academic **format for quotations**, graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables, is easily readable and **stimulates thinking**. The text is free from typos and easy to comprehend.

Strong	Average	Weak	
20	15	< 10	points

Remarks for the referees:

- 1) Download the thesis from the SIS. If you have no access to SIS, please ask the secretary of IPS (katerina.bubnova@fsv.cuni.cz, tel. 296 824 641) for sending you the thesis by e-mail.
- 2) Use the IEPS Thesis Report form only for your comments. **It is a standard at the FSV UK that the Referee's Report is at least 400 words.** In case you assess the thesis as "non-defendable", please explain the concrete reasons for that in detail.
- 3) Retain your critical stance. You cannot confer more than 80 points upon a thesis that does not satisfy research standards in top European universities.
- 4) Upload the Report as PDF/A file into the SIS. Instructions on how to convert .DOCx to PDF/A): „Save as“ – select „PDF“ – check-in „Options or Možnosti“ that „PDF options“ tick „ISO 19005-1 compliant /kompatibilní s/ (PDF/A)“ – „Save“. If you have no access to SIS, please send the unsigned PDF file to the secretary of IPS (katerina.bubnova@fsv.cuni.cz).
- 5) Please deliver to the IPS Secretariat, Pekařská 16, 158 00 Praha 5- Nové Butovice, **two hand-signed originals**. Unfortunately, a photocopied report with signature does not suffice. Sorry.
- 6) Your Report will be remunerated, so we need also your account information (separate from this form).