

# Report on Rigorous Thesis

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

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Mgr. Blanka Weyskrabová</b>
<b>Advisor:</b>	<b>PhDr. Wadim Strielkowski, Ph.D.</b>
<b>Title of the thesis:</b>	<b>Economic Aspects of Remittances and Migration: Case Study of Ukraine and the Czech Republic</b>

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

The Rigorous thesis of Blanka Weyskrabová is a slightly modified version of her Diploma thesis. It analyses the remittance and migration with the focus on Ukrainian workers living in the Czech Republic. The thesis has contributed to the general knowledge about migration in economic sense and is especially valuable for the target country (CZ) because Ukrainian workers are the most important working minority in the Czech Republic. It gives beneficial insight into this field and helps understanding the problems of migration and related remittances.

The thesis is centered on two hypotheses. In a nutshell, what determines remittances and how are they spent. The results suggest that main determinants of migration and subsequent remitting are demographic characteristics and income of the emigrant's family. As for the second question remittances are spent both on non-productive (food and clothes) and productive (mainly house construction) consumption. Education, or investment in it, seem not to be relevant.

The comments and suggestion mentioned in the last opponent's review were addressed in a satisfactory manner with exception of those questioning the data sample and the significance/popularity of Czech Republic in Ukraine from the remittance point of view. The latter point could not have been addressed given the nature of the research question and data available. Otherwise, the level of English was improved by proofreading. Ukraine as a state was introduced in more detailed way and „productiveness of spending“ was also made more clear. Typos were eliminated.

The author of the thesis was granted „Česká spořitelna Award“ for the research performed and won recognition from Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences for an extraordinarily good master diploma thesis. Both of these have further proved the quality of the thesis. I recommended the thesis to be defended as excellent a year ago and **I do recommend** it also this time.

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

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
<i>Literature</i> (max. 20 points)	20
<i>Methods</i> (max. 30 points)	27
<i>Contribution</i> (max. 30 points)	27
<i>Manuscript Form</i> (max. 20 points)	20
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b> (max. 100 points)	<b>94</b>
<b>(doporučuji, nedoporučuji)</b>	<b>Doporučuji</b>

**NAME OF THE REFEREE:** PhDr. Petra Luňáčková

**DATE OF EVALUATION:** 10.3.2013

---

**Referee Signature**

**PhDr. Petra Luňáčková**

**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			
81 – 100		= excellent	
61 – 80		= good	
41 – 60		= satisfactory	
0 – 40		= fail	= nedoporučuji k obhajobě