

REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

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

Title of the thesis:	Health care financing and economic development: A comparative study of the Czech republic and Turkey
Author of the thesis:	Ayşe Ruyem Jakubcová
Referee (incl. titles):	Ing. Mgr. Pavla Mašková, Ph.D

Remark: It is a standard at the FSV UK that the Referee's Report is at least 500 words long. In case you will assess the thesis as "non-defendable", please explain the concrete reasons for that in detail.

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

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Theoretical background (max. 20)</i>	15
<i>Contribution (max. 20)</i>	20
<i>Methods (max. 20)</i>	10
<i>Literature (max. 20)</i>	20
<i>Manuscript form (max. 20)</i>	19
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100)	84
The proposed grade (1-2-3-4)	1

You can even use a decimal point (e.g. giving the grade of 2.5 for 60 points).

Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the 5 numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).

The submitted thesis is devoted to a topic not only interesting, but due the recent negotiations on Turkey's accession to the EU also very current. It is health care financing and health care reforms in Turkey in comparing with health care system development in the Czech Republic.

1) Theoretical background:

The theoretical framework of this thesis is presented as part of research design. The theoretical basis relies on the one theory of policy diffusion. The theory of policy diffusion is relevant for this thesis topic and it provides the framework for the study but I miss in this part of the work the theoretical concept focused on evaluation of health care reforms. On the other hand the author provides the theoretical approach to functions and objectives of health system in the chapter concerning the methods (p.12). The author could more elaborate this theoretical concept and under my consideration used it as the theoretical background.

2) Contribution:

The author presents original ideas on the researched topic and manifests not only the ability to gather available information, but use it for critical thinking and reflection. The author demonstrates the ability to work with literature, policy documents, strategic documents, laws and regulations and to integrate them into a comprehensive and well-structured text. Individual findings are supported by relevant sources.

The author formulates well the research problem and explains the aim of thesis (in the chapter 1). The aim of the work is to understand how health care reforms were initiated and what forces drove them in both countries. This main research objective is completely fulfilled.

3) Methods:

The author states four hypotheses (p.12), which are clearly formulated and further in the text tested. The author explicitly responds to the hypotheses in the chapter 5. Research methodology is based on already existing analyses and documents, event history analysis and especially on the case

studies of the both countries. I appreciate the use of the health policy analysis model in the case study. It allows unifying the approach to studying health care reforms in both countries.

As I mentioned above, the author presents within the methods also the WHO framework functions and objectives of health system. This framework is not applied as the method in the thesis. It is used rather as analytical - theoretical framework of the chapter 5, therefore it would be stated as the theoretical concept.

4) Literature:

The thesis demonstrates that the author studied the relevant literature. The literature review is extensive and appropriate to the research topic.

5) Manuscript form:

This thesis has a logical structure. The author first formulates the research problem, sets the research objective, two research questions and four hypotheses, and describes research design. The second part of the study (chapter 3 and 4) is devoted to the case study in Turkey and in the Czech Republic. The third part (chapter 5) presents comparison of the changes that occurred in the financing of the health care systems in both countries. The conclusion of the thesis is clearly disclosed.

Thesis is well elaborated in terms of language and technical editing level. It is accompanied by relevant tables and graphs.

The formal weakness of the study is a missing List of abbreviations.

The author demonstrated in the whole study the careful and systematic approach to the topic and showed a good knowledge of the research problem. **I would make my suggestion to evaluate the thesis as excellent.**

The question for the oral defense:

Are the Czech health care insurance companies in competition? Isn't the situation in the Czech Republic similar to Turkey where is only one insurance company?

DATE OF EVALUATION: 10.6.2013

Referee Signature

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 for this thesis topic? Were some important theoretical concepts omitted? Was the theory used in the thesis consistently incorporated with the topic and hypotheses tested?

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

2) CONTRIBUTION: Evaluate if the author presents **original ideas** on the topic and aims at demonstrating **critical thinking** and 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 10 0 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 10 points signal an exceptional work, **which requires your explanation "why" it is so**.

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

4) LITERATURE REVIEW: The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and **command of recent literature**. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way and disposes with a representative bibliography. (Remark: 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 much better impression.

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

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

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0 points

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Czech grading	US grading
81 – 100	1	= excellent	= A
61 – 80	2	= good	= B
51 – 60	3	= satisfactory	= C
41 – 50	3	= satisfactory	= D
0 – 40	4	= fail	= not recommended for defence