



## Master's Thesis Evaluation Form

Student's name: Maksym Kolomoiets

Thesis title: Intersubjectivity of economic knowledge:  
Ukraine and Czechia

Name of the supervisor: Doc. Martin Hájek, PhD

Name of the opponent: Paul Blokker

What are the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis? Please give your reasons for the suggested grade in detail below.

1. *Does the author show understanding of one or more theories, and use theory to generate a hypothesis or to make the problem area more understandable.*

Comments:

The initial introduction of the topic is less clear, but in the rich discussion of social-theoretical conceptualizations of knowledge, the focus of the paper does become evident. The theoretical is well set-up, and very adequately discusses different theoretical approaches and different dimensions to knowledge, individual, intersubjective, theoretical, practical and so on. I am surprised, though, that no mention is made of the economic conventions approach (Thévenot, Salais, and others), as it asks many similar questions, and could have been an important way to make the deductive dimension of the research more robust. Also, there is a lack of discussion of the actual economic context in terms of capitalist transformation and distinctive economic mindsets, such as neoliberalism.

2. *Is the research question articulated clearly and properly? Is the research question sufficiently answered in the conclusion?*

Comments:

The research questions are formulated clearly and are well-related to the theoretical discussion. The research questions are adequately answered in the conclusions.

3. *Is the thesis based on relevant research and literature and does it accurately summarize and integrate the information?*

Comments:

The thesis surely engages in very interesting and rich research, using an original methodological approach. The research results are rich and well-discussed.



4. *What is the quality of the data or the other sources? Are the sample method, data collection and data analysis appropriate?*

Comments:

The methods are adequate and the research seems well-executed. The memory game is very interesting, but remains underjustified. Also, the complete lack of pre-outlining of existing intersubjective forms of economic meaning-making lead to a rather loose and open-ended results.

5. *Are the findings relevant to the research question? Are the conclusions of the thesis based on strong arguments?*

Comments:

The findings are relevant and promising, but should be tied more to discussions of economic change and transformation, and economic crisis.

6. *Are the author's thoughts distinguished unambiguously from the borrowed ideas?*

Comments:

Yes, the author is careful in distinguishing his own and other scholars' arguments

7. *Is the thesis containing original/innovative research (in terms of topic, approach, and/or findings)?*

Comments:

The research is surely original, but fails somewhat in linking up to highly relevant recent debates in pragmatic and conventionalist approaches.

8. *What is the quality of style and other formal requirements?*

Comments:

The thesis is well-represented, but suffers somewhat from not an always transparent usage of the English language as well as minor errors.

9. *Are there any other strengths and weaknesses of the thesis, which are not included in the previous questions? Please list them if any.*

Comments:

10. *What topic do you suggest for the discussion in the thesis defence?*



Comments:

The attitude of lay people to expert economic knowledge in times of economic crisis.

Overall assessment of the thesis:

*(Please, state clearly whether the thesis is or is not recommended for a defence and write the main reasons for the recommendation).*

Proposed grade:

*(A- B: excellent, C-D: very good, E: good, F: fail)*

The thesis can be defended as it stands. The grade I suggest is C (very good).

Date: 14/06/2018

Signature: