

BACHELOR'S THESIS EXAMINER REPORT
PPE – Bachelor's in Politics, Philosophy and Economics
Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Thesis title:	The Role of Institutional Change in the Turkish Economic Growth Under AKP Governance
Student's name:	Algushad Gulaliyev
Referee's name:	Doc. Ing. Vladimír Benáček, CSc.

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	50	32
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	15	14
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	15	10
Total		80	56
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	10	9
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	5	3
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	5	4
Total		20	16
TOTAL		100	72

Reviewer's commentary according to the above criteria (min. 1800 characters including spaces when recommending a passing grade, min. 2500 characters including spaces when recommending a failing grade):

The thesis belongs to the field of institutional economics applied on the 15 years of the AKP government in Turkey. Institutional economics' leading economist Daron Acemoglu (Turkish borne !) is referred in the thesis in four titles, which is sufficient. Other important references (such as to Rodrik or Pejovich) are also mentioned. Unfortunately, the thesis' author did not use these rich resources in a way that would a thorough theoretically and empirically based research require, especially in the 3rd and 4th chapters of applied research. The insufficient own contribution to the empirical data processing is what I consider the weakest part of the thesis.

What concerns the references, the presented 110 titles seem to me far too much. It would be more efficient to concentrate on much less but select the substantial academic contributions and avoid the "grey literature".

The technical aspect of the empirical background is rather simple: the author took the empirical evidence from other sources. It is a pity that he did not try to estimate the TFP himself – to show his technical analytical skills The quality of his own empirical research is thus low.

I would appreciate if the topics of corruption, bureaucracy and political adverse selection be discussed more in the thesis.

Proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F): C

Suggested questions for the defence are:

What are the differences in the institutional change between the first and the second halves of the analysed period?

How the detour from democracy is reflected in the economic development in Turkey.

I recommend the thesis for final defence.



Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Quality standard
91 – 100	A	= outstanding (high honor)
81 – 90	B	= superior (honor)
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.