



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Stephan Nentwig

Title: The Influence of Ownership Structures on Socio-Ecological Conflicts
in the Peruvian Mining Sector

Programme/year: MISS/2017

Author of Evaluation (external assessor): Assoc. Prof. Dr. Běla Plechanovová

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	10	7
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	30	25
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	25
<i>Total</i>		80	57
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	10
	Style	5	3
	Formal requirements	5	2
<i>Total</i>		20	15
TOTAL		100	72



Evaluation

Critical comments on

Major criteria:

Even the overall direction of the analysis of the thesis may seem to be quite straightforward, I miss some of the key components of the research design, either completely or they do exist in an underdeveloped form only. First, the Introduction does not present clearly the research question as well as its necessary complements, i.e. giving the reasons why the topic is important and what is the ambition of the thesis.

Second, since the method of analysis rests mainly on statistical assessment of the relations between the variables, it is extremely important that these variables are precisely defined and their assumed relations are rooted in a clear theoretical argument. The key definition then missing is: what constitutes the conflict (the definition on p. 54 states only what the conflict is about but not what it really is).

The thesis discusses a broad choice of relevant literature in a dispersed manner starting right in the Intro chapter up to the end of chapter 3 but without clearly summarizing what the subsequent research design is going to take on board in terms of conceptual framework for the regression models applied in the following chapter.

Methodologically, the choice of the state-owned/controlled foreign company for the case study is rather bringing additional questions than offering any answers. This points relates also to the title of the thesis, as in fact it does not deal with "ownership structures" but more with "types of ownership".

Minor criteria:

The text of the thesis suffers from deficiencies; (1) regarding the lack of references, esp. when economic data are presented (e.g. pp. 11, 13, 14), (2) regarding poor editing (the number of typos, mangling of names, instances



of inconsistent sentences etc. goes well beyond negligible hassle), (3) most importantly, the text refers on several places to digital appendix (for table of variables, for R-code) but none was submitted. Finally, the thesis proposal is absent from the copy of the thesis or from the SIS.

Overall evaluation:

The thesis deserves credit for the scope of literature and resources used for analysis, for the determination to present an original piece of research, both in terms of collection of data and construction of models of the relations of the variables. It is clear from reading the thesis that a lot of work was invested into the topic and it shows on number of places of the text. Overall, the thesis may be considered as a potentially very good contribution both in terms of resources-conflict nexus and in terms of application of quantitative methodology.

Suggested grade:

Still "Very good" – **B-**

Signature:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Masas".