

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

Thesis title:	The effects of strategic partnership between Kazakhstan and China on economic development of Kazakhstan
Student's name:	Gleb Artyukhov
Referee's name:	Doc. Ing. Vladimír Benáček, CSc.

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	22	
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	11	
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	9	
<i>Total</i>		42	
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	7	
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	2	
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	1	
<i>Total</i>		10	
TOTAL		52	

Plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score:

[NB:] If the plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score is above 15%, the reviewer has to include his/her assessment of the originality of the reviewed thesis in his/her review.

As the reviewer, I do not suspect that plagiarism was involved in chapters 1-3. I cannot assess the author's originality of the econometric exercise.

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):

MAJOR ISSUES:

I must praise the choice of the topic, which for the existence of Kazakhstan is of ultimate importance. Kazakhstan is the jewel in the crown among China's neighbours: a huge territory full of natural resources, rich agriculture, high standards of education and advanced heavy industries. These all make the engagement of China very attractive.

Page 6: The hypotheses for testing are well constructed. The problem was in the proofs and the way the hypotheses were tested.

The thesis was rather superficial in the crucial importance of the FDI traffic with CN. FDI deserves to emulate the importance of trade flows.

Descriptions and formulas on pp. 29-37 are corrupt and the related arguments are thus difficult to figure out. Such sloppy work does not allow the reader to understand the text.

Page 32: The 8 lines for the description of your extensive panel data for the estimations are rather insufficient. Similarly, the ways for the selection of the methods of estimation. Why did you not mention the fixed effects and the random effects models?

Comments to Table 1 with coefficients: Your results are highly statistically significant. What kind of quality statistics (indicated as !") allowed you to claim that "the explanatory power of the classical variables varies from 6 to 16%, which is a rather modest value. Under such conditions, it is possible to get rid of the classical variables". But afterwards, you also claim (not in Table 1) high R^2 statistics (84 %). Please explain.

The economic meaning of results and numbers depicted in figures 3-10 is not explained sufficiently. Similarly it is with all that you presented on pp. 45 - 52. It is a highly technical stuff but with little explanatory value to the reader.

The Conclusions of your thesis are just very abstract and not in line with the main quantitative analysis.

References: Taken from the point of academic writing, the author did not stick to the recommended styles, did not array the authors alphabetically and used too many resources that belonged to the grey literature.

Particular comments:

Page 13 Figure 3 should explain the confusing names of countries such as VGB or BMU.

There are too many incomplete sentences (see e.g. p. 17, the 3rd line from the bottom) signalling the hasty work, which was later visible in the work with econometrics where technicalities were not matched by economic interpretations.

Pages 22-23: There is a lot of confusion about counting percentages which do not correspond to figures in table 7. E.g. "The share of Kazakhstan's trade turnover with China in recent years varies significantly at around 15-20%. Since 2013 to 2016, the weight of exports has tended to decrease, but up to the period 2020-2022 the share of export from Kazakhstan to China increased to about 60%. Imports, on the contrary, have increased for the period 2013-2016, but during 2020-2022 dramatically increased to the 60% level (Figure 7)".

The first 3 chapters covering nearly half of the thesis are mere data gathering underpinned by no theory. That is not an academic approach to research.

Chapter 2.2: Those 9 lines of praise, was that all that your research found about the prospects???

Figure 9 is not a good review of your communication with the reader about your research findings.

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

Suggested questions for the defence are:

Please explain the highlights of your econometric estimations. Explain also the economic meaning of your statement on p. 60: "another methodology was used to build a gravity

model based on decomposition by dummy variables into a panel data model. In this class of models, multilateral resistance is analyzed on the basis of decomposition of variance by dummy variables and their subsequent interpretation".

I recommend the thesis for the final defence. However, I leave the final assessment of the econometrics on the commission of examiners. If Mr. Artyukhov really mastered the presented packages of econometrics while taking just one introductory exam from statistics (JPB159), he could deserve more appreciation.

Vladimir Benáček

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.