

Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague

Student:	Petra Budská
Advisor:	Julie Chytilová, Ph.D.
Title of the thesis:	Vliv ekonomické krize na finanční zdroje neziskových organizací

OVERALL ASSESSMENT (provided in English, Czech, or Slovak):

In her thesis Petra Budská studies the effect of the recent economic crisis on financing of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the Czech Republic.

First, I would like to appreciate that Petra collected data from the NGOs using a questionnaire survey. She also made a lot of progress in thinking about the research questions and the whole structure of the thesis since she started to work on it. The thesis is quite well structured, however at some points it is difficult for the reader to follow the text.

I also have serious concerns about the data analysis and mainly about the interpretation of the results. One of the main variables of interest is the „sensitivity“ (citlivost) which shows the percentage change in the proportion of a specific financial source (donation, EU funds, state, etc.) on total funds of an NGO in the period before and after the crisis. In the questionnaire, donations, funds, etc. are not measured in absolute terms, but in percentages. We do not know whether, e.g. donations, increased or decreased in absolute terms, but only whether their share in the portfolio changed and how. Therefore, I do not think it is appropriate to interpret the results based on this variable as the willingness of the donors to donate, or reaction of the donors to the crisis. I also do not understand why „utility level of money“ should be higher when the sensitivity is higher than 100 (this just tells us that the share of a source increased by more than 100%, e.g. from 10% to 25%). Moreover, the variable is not a parallel to elasticity as Petra claims since its calculation is based only on one variable in two points of time whereas we always need change in two variables to calculate elasticity. All these shortcomings are reflected in the interpretation of the results throughout the text.

In the case of successful defense, I recommend grade „dobře“ (satisfactory, 3).

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

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Literature</i> (max. 20 points)	10
<i>Methods</i> (max. 30 points)	10
<i>Contribution</i> (max. 30 points)	15
<i>Manuscript Form</i> (max. 20 points)	10
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points)	45
GRADE (1 – 2 – 3 – 4)	3

NAME OF THE REFEREE: Julie Chytilová

DATE OF EVALUATION: May 31, 2011

Referee Signature

EXPLANATION OF CATEGORIES AND SCALE:

LITERATURE REVIEW: *The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and command of recent literature. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way.*

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0

METHODS: *The tools used are relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the author's level of studies. The thesis topic is comprehensively analyzed.*

Strong Average Weak
30 15 0

CONTRIBUTION: *The author presents original ideas on the topic demonstrating critical thinking and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and empirics. There is a distinct value added of the thesis.*

Strong Average Weak
30 15 0

MANUSCRIPT FORM: *The thesis is well structured. The student uses appropriate language and style, including academic format for graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables and disposes with a complete bibliography.*

Strong Average Weak
20 10 0

Overall grading:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE		
81 – 100	1	= excellent	= výborně
61 – 80	2	= good	= velmi dobře
41 – 60	3	= satisfactory	= dobře
0 – 40	4	= fail	= nedoporučuji k obhajobě