

REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

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

Title of the thesis:	Mapping Institutional Development: An Analysis of Deposit Insurance in Argentina
Author of the thesis:	Dustin Alauzen Lane
Referee (incl. titles):	Doc. Ing. Tomáš Cahlík, CSc.

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>	15
<i>Methods (max. 20)</i>	15
<i>Literature (max. 20)</i>	5
<i>Manuscript form (max. 20)</i>	20
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100)	70
The proposed grade (1-2-3-4)	2

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).

I figure as supervisor of this thesis but I have not consulted with the author anything. I deny any responsibility for this thesis and my report is not a supervisor's report.

1) Theoretical background:

Theoretical background is summarized on about 14 pages of "Review of Literature". Author takes a couple of basic texts of well - known institutionalists and summarizes their ideas.

2) Contribution:

Author formulates (not clearly) two hypotheses based on conclusions of two papers concerning deposit insurance system in Argentina. He denies those conclusions based on his own analysis described in this thesis. He presents his own framework for institutional analysis that supports his denial.

3) Methods:

Methods are used correctly but I have a strong feeling that the author stays in his thinking on the surface of the phenomena. (This is exactly what - in my opinion – the supervisor only can seriously evaluate, after a systematic work with the student.)

4) Literature:

This is the weakest point of this thesis. Referencing is really horrible. Many times, the author only is referenced to without the year. Dani Rodrik (named on page 26 and others) is not in the list of references. Author uses sometimes Acemgclu and sometimes Acemoglu (this is correct). (This just stresses my feeling that this thesis is not result of a serious work.)

5) Manuscript form:

Except of citations, I have no more objections.

Recommendation for the defense: I recommend to the defense committee to discuss deeply any part of this thesis with the aim either to verify or deny my feelings. In the case of denial, I think B is the appropriate evaluation of this thesis.

DATE OF EVALUATION: August 13, 2016

Tomáš Cahlík _____
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