

REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

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

Title of the thesis:	Globalization and small countries – unique challenges, universal solutions
Author of the thesis:	Katerina Petkovska
Referee (incl. titles):	Doc. Ing. Vladimír Benáček, CSc.

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

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Theoretical background (max. 20)</i>	17
<i>Contribution (max. 20)</i>	17
<i>Methods (max. 20)</i>	16
<i>Literature (max. 20)</i>	20
<i>Manuscript form (max. 20)</i>	16
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100)	86
The proposed grade (1-2-3-4)	1,3

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).

1) Theoretical background:

By its title and topic coverage this thesis is a model example of a thesis which belongs to the programme of IEPS (Int. Economic and Political Studies): it covers a serious international problem (globalization) full of contradictory externalities; addresses its economic, political and social impacts on a small country subject to dynamic evolution; the analysis requires the use of a varied mix of methods; it addresses the use of policies; and the author must cope with a wide list of existing literature whose conclusions are not always consistent.

I judge that the author has managed to sail through all these snags highly satisfactorily. She started with a clear set of relevant hypotheses to be tested and referred to relevant theoretical resources on the globalization issue (chapter 1). The theoretical background is not concentrated in one chapter since the topic itself is highly heterogenous and broad, and a simple analytical treatment of its evolution is not possible. Nevertheless, Miss Petkovska offers numerous theoretical approaches drawn from the world literature (e.g. infant industry argument or Washington Consensus), which are later applied in her study.

Theories are provided in three sections dealing with globalization, evolution of openness in a historical perspective, trade and international finance, and international property rights.

2) Contribution:

This aspect has two main inputs: the way how the author was able to synthesize most varied approaches in the world literature and draw guidelines used for her analysis, which would not be contradictory or discontinuous. I think that here she succeeded in presenting such a unitary view. Her mastery over historical facts and observations from life deserves praise.

The main contribution is expected to be concentrated in chapter 5 (pp. 41-56). However, here the author could be more resolute and use the knowledge from previous chapters more intensively for interpreting the situation and policies in Macedonia. This chapter is full of data and graphs that, potentially, could be better connected with observations and principles derived in chapters 1-4.

Chapter 5.2 with policy recommendations has been more successful in that, thought it could be even longer in its scope.

3) Methods:

Miss Petkovska combines four methods in her thesis: inductive (based on data and tables that are dominant and presented also in a lengthy appendix), simple deductive by drawing conclusions from assumptions (without adhering to any formal instruments), historical (used widely especially in ch. 2) and analogy when comparing various countries. Maybe the data could be processed further pointing to averages and trends in growth.

4) Literature:

The references (used often and conveniently) are very rich (covering 5 pages) with world-renowned authors featuring among them.

5) Manuscript form: There were some typos in the text – e.g. the misspelling of “Challenges” in the very title of the thesis. The thesis covering 75 pages (spacing 1.5) is much longer than the recommended minimum of approximately 40 pages with spacing 2. The text is written in an interesting, reader-friendly style, rich with data and bearing personal “touches” and open views of the writer. The text could be, however, better optically structured into clearly separated paragraphs.

Conclusions of the reviewer: I consider the thesis of Miss Petkovska as a successful commitment where minor shortcomings cannot preclude my final grade of 1 (výborně, excellent).

DATE OF EVALUATION: 11 June 2014

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