

Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

Student:	Veronika Dovhunová
Advisor:	Petr Jánský, MSc.
Title of the thesis:	Development Assistance and the Approach of Slovak Republic to Developing Countries

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

The thesis concerns numerical evaluation of the approach of Slovak Republic towards “poor” or “developing” countries. To do so, it uses methods designed by recognized international-aid-related organizations, mainly various United Nations’ agencies, which are then applied on Slovak data. The first part concerns historical introduction and definitions of various types of aid. The latter parts cover chosen indices composition while discussing the meaning and pitfalls of their construction. Finally the approach is being applied on Slovak Republic’s data to construct its own version of the evaluation in order to be comparable with other “developed” nations.

The paper is written with quite good English, well structured and “readable”. As the key advantage of this paper is I’d see the originality of its key, because, to my knowledge, similar study has not been done yet. It is necessary to appreciate the author’s courage to explore a problem with given method but little data available in some sort of centralized datasets.

While trying to make a comparison of individual countries, it is logical to use some sort of standard or broadly accepted method, as it is usually the only way to do so. The only drawback of such an approach is that the author usually gives up the creative part of the work – say developing his or her own model. Then the author must stay with description and data collection. The latter could (and definitely was in this case as well) a challenging task as the information is likely to be scattered and the access to it is usually quite limited. As the biggest objection to this thesis, I as a reader would mention the description of author’s work with Slovak data, more precisely the lack of it. The calculation is limited to a result of 3,9 leaving the reader to go back in reading and search for all the pieces of the puzzle in order to learn the composition of this result. I miss some description of underlying data, their evolution in time or at least some “interesting selection” of it. Moreover, while trying to look for the results of intermediary calculation steps or parameters the reader is forced to scan through the appendices without any guide or link in the text.

Apart from above mentioned issues I have no other serious objections, only a set of minor ones listed in the attachment of this report.

To summarize the evaluation, I do recommend this thesis for the defense. In the case of successful defense, I recommend “**chvalitebně**” (**very good, 2**).

Suggested question for defense: see the attachment

Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

Student:	Veronika Dovhunová
Advisor:	Petr Jánský, MSc.
Title of the thesis:	Development Assistance and the Approach of Slovak Republic to Developing Countries

Grammatical and other minor issues
(always the page number and the problematic text)

All pages: Definite and indefinite articles' check would help the paper much.

1 Infrastructures

2 perceiving → perception

2 a large scale of many other factors
influence significantly welfare

2 devided

3 With defining development aid arises some confusion - word order

4 bothe

6 was establish – were established

7 it was caused partly because of the expansion – caused by

8 pessimism that the aid - ???

9 the Global Financial crisis in 2007

10 From one ideologically

13 less Luxemburg – except Lux...

14 but also among policy advocate ??? Advocates?

17 face up a problem

17 could be satisfied

20 country's log GDP per capita which reflects its poverty???

22 Developing countries are from a great part dependent on exports, as they generate

22 protection by the developed nations

24 Revealed Openness

The second indicator, revealed openness, which gets remaining 25%, is a ratio of imports from non-DAC countries per importer's GDP. The data come from UN COMTRADE data set. All EU members score the same. Why is it so? Is the share of non-DAC imports really the same for all EU countries, or is the difference negligible or is that a simplifying assumption by the dataset collectors?

25 4. *Other Support for Overseas Investment* – (missing max pts)

26 considered to be the purpose

27 *Both indicators are weighted to reflect the poverty of sending countries* – how? „Weight to reflect poverty“ is quite a broad description.

28 fisheries and biodiversity (no comma)

28 *Although the rich developed countries contribute more to this problem by emitting large amount of CO₂, as well as by producing fossil fuels* – this is a rather misleading statement as vast volumes of fossil fuels are being produced in developing countries as well

32 more appropriate than

32 *depending on the target's country* – target country?

Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

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

Student:	Veronika Dovhunová
Advisor:	Petr Jánky, MSc.
Title of the thesis:	Development Assistance and the Approach of Slovak Republic to Developing Countries

35 *Private giving* = 0; 000472 _ GNI 1951; 99 _ JAP + 2793; 58 _ USA 735; 211 _ IT- I miss an explanation of what this equation means to non-USA, non-Italy and non-Japan countries, such as Slovakia. Does it mean that the three countries are the only ones beyond the 0,000472*NGI rule? Since the three dummies would be 0 for SK, I guess, the GNI would be \$45 000/0,000472 = \$93 338 983 It seems to me a bit low for the whole Slovak Republic. Or my understanding of the logic of mentioned equation is just misled.

36 personal

40 ways of providing assistance.

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

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Literature</i> (max. 20 points)	20
<i>Methods</i> (max. 30 points)	12
<i>Contribution</i> (max. 30 points)	15
<i>Manuscript Form</i> (max. 20 points)	16
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points)	63
GRADE (1 – 2 – 3 – 4)	2

NAME OF THE REFEREE: PhDr. Jakub Mikolášek

DATE OF EVALUATION: 22.8.2011

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